DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 296 040 UD 026 237

TITLE	Incentives in Education. Hearing on Examining Ways To Improve and Strengthen the Quality of Education for the City of Boston and Other Cities across the Nation, before the Committee on Labor and Human Resources. United States Senate, One Hundredth Congress, First Session (Boston, Massachusetts, October 5, 1987).
INSTITUTION	Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources.
REPORT NO	Senate-Hrg-100-502
PUB DATE	88
NOTE	135p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402.
PUB TYPE	Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Educational Improvement; Elementary Secondary Education; *Federal Aid; Federal Programs; High Risk Students; *Incentives; Magnet Schools; School Business Relationship; School Districts; *School Effectiveness; Teacher Supply and Demand; *Urban Education
IDENTIFIERS	Boston Compact; *Boston Public Schools MA

ABSTRACT

This transcript of a Congressional hearing concerns improving and strengthening the quality of education in Boston and other cities. The testimony centers around the systemwide planning process that has established the Boston Plan for Excellence in the Public Schools and the incentive programs that have been implemented. A major issue is federal and state involvement in such plans and policies. Suggestions for this involvement are the following: (1) funding for nationwide replication of successful educational programs; (2) a student loan forgiveness program for college graduates who teach where teacher shortages are present; (3) the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act; (4) more research upon which programs and policies can be based; and (5) rewards for outstanding teachers and schools. Other witnesses endorsed a radical restructuring of the schools and changes in the role of the teacher that would make teaching a true profession. Parental involvement and choice are notions that are being discussed in many locales. This could make schools compete for students, thus forcing them to improve what they have to offer. (VM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED296040

7-7-88

S. Hrg. 100-502

INCENTIVES IN EDUCATION

HEARING

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON
LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES
UNITED STATES SENATE

ONE HUNDREDTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

EXAMINING WAYS TO IMPROVE AND STRENGTHEN THE QUALITY OF EDUCATION FOR THE CITY OF BOSTON AND OTHER CITIES ACROSS THE NATION

OCTOBER 5, 1987, BOSTON, MA

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality
● Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

Printed for the use of the Committee on Labor and Human Resources

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
81-185 WASHINGTON : 1988

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office
U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

UD 026 237

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES

EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts, *Chairman*

CLAIBORNE PELL, Rhode Island
HOWARD M. METZENBAUM, Ohio
SPARK M. MATSUNAGA, Hawaii
CHRISTOPHER J. DODD, Connecticut
PAUL SIMON, Illinois
TOM HARKIN, Iowa
BROCK ADAMS, Washington
BARBARA A. MIKULSKI, Maryland

ORRIN G. HATCH, Utah
ROBERT T. STAFFORD, Vermont
DAN QUAYLE, Indiana
STROM THURMOND, South Carolina
LOWELL P. WEICKER, Jr., Connecticut
THAD COCHRAN, Mississippi
GORDON J. HUMPHREY, New Hampshire

Thomas M. Rollins, *Staff Director and Chief Counsel*
Hayden G. Bryan, *Minority Staff Director*

CONTENTS

STATEMENTS

Monday, October 5, 1987

BOSTON, MA

Page

Finn, Chester, Assistant Secretary, U.S. Department of Education 16
  Prepared statement 19
Kraus, Senator Richard, senate chairman, and Representative Nicholas Paleologos, house chairman, Massachusetts Joint Committee on Education 86
  Joint prepared statement of Mr. Kraus and Mr. Paleologos 90
Mills, Dr. Richard, special assistant for education to Governor Kean of New Jersey; Francis Keppel, Harvard School of Education; Dorothy Jones, director, desegration integration, Cambridge public schools; and Sy Fliegel, deputy superintendent of Community School District 4 33
  Prepared statements of:
    Dr. Mills 36
    Mrs. Jones 60
    Mr. Keppel 46
    Mr. Fliegel 73
Urbanski, Dr. Adam, vice president, American Federation of Teachers; and Keith Geiger, vice president, National Education Association 96
  Prepared statements of:
    Dr. Urbanski 98
    Mr. Geiger 114
Wilson, Laval, superintendent of schools, Boston, MA 1
  Prepared statement (with attachments) 3

INCENTIVES IN EDUCATION

MONDAY, OCTOBER 5, 1987

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES,
Boston, MA.

The Committee met, pursuant to notice, at the East Boston High School, East Boston, Massachusetts, Senator Edward M. Kennedy (chairman) presiding.

STATEMENT OF LAVAL WILSON, SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS, BOSTON, MA

Mr. WILSON. Good morning. I am Laval Wilson, superintendent of schools for Boston. I am delighted to be here this morning to welcome Senator Kennedy for this very important hearing. Senator Kennedy, of course, is chairing the Committee on Labor and Human Resources. Along with Headmaster John Poto, staff and students here, I and the school committee and members of our staff and this city, we are delighted to take pleasure to host Senator Kennedy who is a very great friend of education nationwide and a very real friend of the public schools here in Boston. The Senator and his able staff always follow us, always hear us, always help us, and we were grateful to him and glad to have him among us today.

I welcome, too, all of the distinguished witnesses that are going to be here to speak. If we can provide you any assistance, we will be delighted to do so. The topic on which all of these witnesses will speak is indeed important in syntex and education. In Boston we recognize that carrots work better than sticks, and we try to provide the carrots that work to keep young people in school and doing their best. Some are after school jobs, jobs after graduation, access to college for all graduates through counseling and final dollars.

We will submit testimony also on those programs to your committee and on the system-wide planning process we have been using to establish the Boston education plan. The plan gives specific goals and actions and 16 major initiatives for improving Boston public schools. We believe that clear goals are effective incentives to the teachers and administrators and all support staff.

There are near Boston several incentive programs with potential for replication nationwide, but there is an area of needs for incentives where Federal Government alone can hope to make a difference. The incentive for the most able college graduates to keep in our schools, if not for an entire career than for some years and give added incentives to teach were the challenge is greater and those school districts where the poverty is greater.

A student loan forgiveness program which would not cost current dollars could be the compelling incentive needed to solve the nationwide and very critical problems of few teachers. How many students can be available for us, and the types of people who go into education, all of these are the heart of the quality of education issue facing this country and the Senate program in this area would be right on target in improving education in the nations schools.

I want to use my privileging honor of introducing Senator Kennedy. Senator, we are delighted you are here in East Boston High and we welcome you and your staff, and we are very pleased to host this incentive. I was told, as I was chatting with some of my colleagues, probably one of the first incentives we could ask for, however, would be incentives for more heat contribution, but we think that the weather that we were having on the northeast part of this country is a temporary part of blizzard and hopefully the snow season will be put off a little bit. Thank you for coming, and welcome to East Boston High.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Wilson (with attachments) follows:]

Comments of Laval S. Wilson
Superintendent of the Boston Public Schools
October 5, 1987

before the Senate Comittee on
Labor and Human Resources

Incentives in Education

I am here this morning to welcome Senator Edward Kennedy to East Boston High School. Along with Headmaster John Poto, his staff and students, it gives me great pleasure to act as host to Senator Kennedy, a man who is a very great friend of education nationwide,and a very real friend of the Boston Public Schools. The Senator and his able staff always welcome us, always hear us and always help us. We are grateful to him and glad to have him among us.

Welcome, too, to the distinguished witnesses. The topic on which they will speak is important: - Incentives in Education. In Boston we recognize that carrots work better than sticks, and we try to provide the carrots that work to keep young people in school and doing their best - summer and after school jobs, jobs after graduation, access to college for all graduates through counseling and final dollar scholarships. We will submit testimony on these programs, and on the system-wide planning process we used to produce the Boston Education Plan. The plan gives specific goals and actions for sixteen areas of school operations. We believe clear goals are effective incentives for teachers and administrators.

There are here in Boston several incentive programs with potential for replication nationwide, but there is an area of need for incentives where the federal government alone has the scope to make a difference - incentives for the most able college graduates to teach in our schools, if not for an entire career then for some years, and to give added incentives to teach where the challenge is greatest, in those school district where poverty is the greatest barrier to achievement.

A student loan forgiveness program, which would not cost current dollars, could be the compelling incentive needed to solve the nationwide and very critical problem of teacher shortages. Who teaches, and how many students each teacher must teach, are issues at the heart of quality in education. An incentive program in this area would be right on target for improving education in the nation's schools.

I won't abuse my priviledge of introducing the Senator by taking any more of his time. Senator Kennedy, you are very welcome here, and I wish for you a very productive hearing.

Attachments:

The Boston Compact Programs

The Boston Education Plan, a description of the planning process

Demographics on the Teaching Force - our needs for recruiting teachers

The Boston Compact

The Boston Compact is one of the most successful collaborative efforts between a school district and its community in the country. The Compact is not a program in itself; it is an agreement, the gradual fulfillment of which has led to the development of a growing number of innovative programs and services. These programs are linked conceptually and operationally, and provide for Boston Public School students a comprehensive sequence of opportunity.

(1) The Compact Agreement

The Boston Compact began in the fall of 1982. The centerpiece of all Compact activity is a formal agreement, first between the Boston School Committee and the city's business community, and then expanding to include local colleges and universities in 1983; and local building trade unions in 1984. The agreement is a simple quid pro quo which assures measurable improvement in the quality of education in the public schools, in return for increased opportunity and support for students and graduates - in jobs, careers, higher education, and skilled trades.

Specifically, the Boston School Committee has agreed:

- To improve student attendance each year in the city's public high schools;
- To improve test scores in reading and mathematics on standardized achievement tests each year;
- To reduce each year the high drop-out rate in middle and high schools;
- To increase each year the number of students who continue their education in college after graduation;
- To increase the number of graduates each year who successfully enter career employment.

In return, the business community has agreed to hire Boston Public School students and graduates on a priority basis for summer jobs, part-time jobs during school, and for entry level career opportunities after graduation. Businesses have also agreed to increase their support for business partnerships with individual high schools, to improve scholarship opportunities, and to assist teaching faculty with their professional development. To date, 352 Boston area corporations have signed a formal Boston Compact pledge.

The higher education community in Boston has also agreed to similar support in return for improved education. Twenty-five area colleges and universities have signed a pledge to assist students while in school with guidance and higher education assistance; and to accept Boston Public School students on a priority basis into their undergraduate programs; and to support Boston graduates, particularly during their first years of college, to succeed academically and socially.

Lastly, the local building trade unions have also signed a formal pledge, to increase access to Boston graduates in the twenty-four local building trade apprenticeship programs, in return for continuing measurable school improvement.

(2) Programs

These three interrelated agreements have created a climate of opportunity for Boston Public School youth which has resulted in a set of programs supporting young people from the beginning of high school through post-secondary education and beyond. These include programs in employment, guidance, and financial assistance.

(A) Employment and Preparation

The Boston Summer Jobs Program is a youth incentive program which gives Boston students a chance to earn a high paying summer job through their record of good attendance and school performance. In 1986, a total of 614 corporations hired 2,591 students. Student wages in this program have been the highest of any summer job campaign in the nation for the past four years.

The Job Collaborative is an employment preparation and support program which places private industry staff in each high school who coordinate school work-study efforts and place students in part-time jobs tailored to each student's schedule. Participating employers cooperate with school faculty to make student work experiences conditional upon good academic performance. In 1986, over 1,500 students received part-time jobs and employment counseling.

Compact Careers places graduates in permanent employment with clear advancement opportunities. Since 1983, over 2,500 graduates have been placed in careers in businesses committed to the goals of the Compact. Job retention, advancement, and part-time college tuition assistance statistics are uniquely high.

Business Partnerships links 25 major Boston corporations in partnerships with each of the city's 18 public high schools. Partnerships are diverse, and include a rich variety of activities each year between the high schools and their business partners, in curriculum development, staff development, student enrichment, career exploration, and financial assistance.

Opportunity in Boston is a new Boston Compact initiative which extends employment opportunity for Boston graduates through college and into long-term management opportunity. Boston graduates who successfully complete their college education will be given entry-level management jobs on a priority basis in major local corporations.

(B) Guidance and Support

The College and University Partnerships link 25 post-secondary education institutions with individual Boston high schools to assist faculty and students in curriculum development, staff development, management, college selection, and other activities related to continuing education.

The Higher Education Assistance Center has been established to provide students and faculty with a fully equipped, centralized facility and staff whose mission is to assist high school students in the process of selecting and applying to higher education. Located at the Boston Public Library, the Center works closely with school guidance counselors and with college partnership staff.

(C) Financial Assistance

In 1984, executives from the major corprations sponsoring the Boston Compact established the Boston Plan for Excellence - a permanent endowment in support of the Boston Public Schools. The Plan for Excellence, administered by the Boston Foundation, has grown steadily in the past two years, and has established a set of programs aimed at providing financial assistance to students and faculty in the schools. To date, this endowment has grown to over $8 million.

The Bank of Boston Education Incentive Grants offers competitive grants to public school educators to assist them in developing innovative ideas in the classroom. Endowed by a gift of $1.5 million from the Bank of Boston, this effort has resulted in over $300,000 in direct classroom assistance to teachers.

The Bank of New England Teacher Incentives has provided $500,000 for direct grants to Boston teaching faculty to enhance their professional development. These funds have given both individual grants and personal stipends to afford teachers the opportunity to explore ways to extend their professional development.

The John Hancock Heart Program has established a $1 Million endowment to support Boston middle schools, particularly in the areas of athletics and support to at-risk youth.

Access provides financial counseling and scholarship assistance to Boston Public School students and graduates. A $1 Million endowment from The New England, and a challenge grant from the Boston Foundation resulting to date in over $4 million additional funds, provides a financial base for two related services: a staff of Access counselors trained to assist students to take full advantage of publicly available scholarship opportunities; and funds to give students "last dollar" support to round out their higher education financial package.

In the fall of 1986, the announcement of Opportunity in Boston and Access meant that Boston Public School students now have a complete sequence of opportunity: summer jobs and employment counseling during high school; entry level careers on graduation; support and priority acceptance at local colleges and universities; scholarship assistance to enable all Boston graduates to go to college; and lastly, the promise of a career in management for successfully completing a college education. All of these incentives are connected to the assurance of continuing education improvement in basic skills, attendance, and student retention in the Boston Public Schools.

(1) New Programs for At-Risk Youth

As a result of Superintendent Laval S. Wilson's new $2 Million initiative to reduce the level of dropouts from the Boston Public Schools, a new set of programs have been put in place during Academic Year 1986 - 1987.

These programs are closely coordinated with one another to provide the first steps toward a comprehensive service plan for At-Risk youth in the city of Boston. The programs serve two needs: prevention - programs based in Boston schools to help prevent dropouts; and re-entry - programs based in the community which attract dropouts back to school.

Prevention:

Compact Ventures: An innovative program aimed at high school students who need remediation assistance and help to stay in school. Ventures provides three services:

(1) Outreach to parents and family to keep them informed about student educational issues.

(2) Remediation Specialists to provide innovative education approaches for at-risk youth.

(3) Case Management - a unique and highly effective form of intervention to advocate for students, connect them with a wide variety of services, and solve problems to help them stay in school and succeed.

Project Promise: a new program in three middle schools this year, Project Promise provides students with extended day education, Saturday instruction, and a reorganized academic program aimed at increasing basic education skills.

Re-Entry

Boston Community Schools: Two successful programs operated by the Community Schools have been expanded this year for the purpose of recruiting dropouts back into alternative education and coordinating their schooling with the Boston Public Schools:

(1) City Roots - a GED program - has been expanded to five underserved neighborhoods, and the program is being retooled to provide a public school-approved curriculum to re-enroll dropouts in Boston high schools.

(2) Back to School - an alternative school for middle school-aged dropouts, Back to School has been expanded to new sites and will serve 50 youth with a Boston Public School approved curriculum.

Mayor's Office of Jobs and Community Services: A constellation of alternative education programs operated successfully by the Mayor's Office for the past 8 years has been expanded this year to bring more dropouts back into alternative education and to connect their education program with the appropriate Boston Public high school.

For information on The Boston Compact and the array of programs and services connected through the Compact to the Boston Public Schools, please call or write Edward Dooley, Executive Director, Boston Compact, 26 Court Street, Boston, Massachusetts, 02108. Phone 617-726-6200.

THE BOSTON PLAN FOR EXCELLENCE IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Sixty State Street Boston, Massachusetts 02109 Tel (617) 723-7489

THE BOSTON PLAN
FOR EXCELLENCE IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

The Boston Plan for Excellence in the Public Schools is the nation's only permanent community-based endowment fund for public education. It was established with a $1.5 million gift from Bank of Boston, in observance of the bank's 200th anniversary on February 7, 1984. In three years, The Plan has grown from a single-concept school grants program into a foundation with six major programmatic activities, and has attracted significant additional financial support.

Overview

The Plan is overseen by an independent board of trustees, consisting of business, education and community leaders. Administrative support is provided by the Boston Public Schools and the Boston Foundation, which also provided essential start-up funding for The Plan's programs.

From the beginning, there was consensus that the mission of The Plan should be broad. Any activity determined to be helpful in improving the educational opportunity of individual students in the Boston Schools would be within the mandate of The Plan. However, from this broad mandate, six specific programs have emerged.

School Grants

The School Initiatives Grants Program, endowed by Bank of Boston, provides competitive grants of up to $10,000 for school-based projects designed to help individual elementary and high schools achieve excellence. Grants recognize proposals addressing concerns that include basic skills, computer literacy, performing arts, and multi-cultural education. To date, approximately $200,000 has been awarded.

TRUSTEES

Dr Daniel S Cheever Jr
Chairman
William L Brown
Dr Joseph M Cronin
Alexander V d'Arbeloff
Lawrence S DiCara Esq
Freda Garcia
Avram J Goldberg
Mary Ann Hardenbergh
Rev Michael E Haynes
Arnold S Hiatt
Hon Julian T Houston
Dr Ellen S Jackson
Peter H McCormick
Rev J Donald Monan S J
E James Morton
Edward E Phillips
David Rockefeller Jr
Ex Officio
Dr Laval S Wilson

Teacher Fellowships

The Teacher Fellowship Program, supported by a 5-year, $300,000 grant from the Bank of New England, assists up to 60 outstanding teachers each year to renew their own educational growth through participation in a specially designed Teachers' Institute and to share their new skills with their colleagues. Follow up workshops are scheduled throughout the year. Each year a different subject area is designated as the focal point for the program, and different colleges or univesities are selected to host the Institutes. In 1984, Boston elementary school science teachers participated in summer Institutes at Simmons College and Wheelock College. In 1985, the program concentrated on writing and was hosted by the University of Massachusetts. In 1986, Northeastern University sponsored an Institute focusing on math. Lesley College will host the 1987 reading program.

ACCESS

ACCESS is a student financial aid advising and scholarship program which assists graduates of Boston Public Schools who wish to pursue postsecondary education by providing information, counseling, and "last dollar" scholarship support to students who do not receive sufficient financial aid from other sources. Through the ACCESS Scholars Program, students receive information and encouragement related to their academic progress and financial aid award status while they complete postsecondary education. In 1985, 100 ACCESS scholars received "last dollar" scholarships averaging $500; in 1986, 150 ACCESS scholars received scholarships averaging $535. ACCESS scholars can re-apply yearly for support throughout their postsecondary education.

In 1985, The New England gave a $1 million gift to initiate an endowment fund for ACCESS and the Boston Foundation provided operational support with a grant of $130,000. In 1986, the Boston Foundation issued a $1 million challenge grant on the condition that local companies raise $2 million for operational and scholarship endowments. More than 50 companies, professional firms, and foundations have responded including The Massachusetts Higher Education Assistance Corporation which established a new $1 million endowment for operations. The pledges from these companies raise the total ACCESS endowment to $5.5 million.

HEART

The Hancock Endowment for Academics, Recreation, and Teaching (HEART) supports academic and athletic programs in Boston's middle schools. Established on Valentine's Day, 1985 with a $1 million endowment from the John Hancock Financial Services, the program involves competitive school grants to improve basic skills, especially for "at-risk" students, as well as a citywide intramural sports program in conjunction with Boston's community schools. To date more than $250,000 has been awarded for academic and athletic programs.

SEED

On February 11, 1987, the partners of Goodwin, Procter & Hoar, a Boston law firm, announced an endowment gift of $1 million to The Boston Plan to establish SEED -- Support for Early Educational Development. SEED will fund K-3 programs in the Boston Public Schools.

School and Its Neighborhood

The School and Its Neighborhood, a new program initiated by The Boston Plan, will encourage closer relations between high schools and the communities in which they are located. This program will feature the idea of "youth in philanthropy" as its core component. The Plan hopes that through this program, students can learn about the process of "giving" in much the same way as a foundation distributes its funds. Funding for this program has been provided by grants from the Public Education Fund and The Hyams Trust.

The history of the Boston Plan for Excellence in the Public Schools has been one of dramatic and rapid growth and development. The genuine spirit of partnership and cooperation between the private and public sectors has been the most important ingredient in its success.

April 1, 1987

(Note: In the interest of economy, two additional documents supplied the committee by Mr. Wilson and entitled, "The Boston Education Plan," and "Professional Personnel, An R&D Accountability Study," were retained in the files of the committee.)

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR KENNEDY

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Dr. Laval Wilson, for your introduction and presentation. You have been a good friend, I have enjoyed working with you. You have appeared before our committee in Washington on a number of different occasions involving the quality of education in the City of Boston, and I am grateful to you for taking the time to be with us here this morning to discuss an aspect of education which I think needs further examination.

The committee is looking forward to working with you as we develop the authorization of our Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the principal legislation directed towards the support for elementary and secondary education. I personally appreciate the work you are doing here today. The committee looks forward to reviewing the various testimony that we will gather over the course of the morning to find out how we can improve and strengthen the quality of education for the City of Boston, and really for all the cities across the nation. I'm very grateful to you for your presence here this morning. I know you have a lot of responsibilities. We will look forward to working with you after we have reviewed the material from these hearings.

I want to say at the outset how appreciative I am that John Poto was willing to be our host here this morning. Many of those that are here to make presentations have come down to Washington and appeared before our Education Committee. I don't think that, quite frankly, we get out as much into the rest of the country as we would like to. I'm a strong believer in bringing our various committees that are making decisions out into the communities where those decisions are going to affect the real lives of people in the communities. This is important in order to have some understanding of the issues that we are trying to deal with.

So, if it has been in the areas of education and health, or other areas in which our committee has primary jurisdiction, we try to do that on each and every occasion that permits us to do so. It always takes some cooperation and some hospitality, and East Boston High School has been exceedingly successful and hospitable in working out this forum.

I want to thank the witnesses this morning. I want to thank the members of the student body for joining with us—I'm sure you'd rather be back to class. I know that there will be some period of transition in which students will be coming and leaving, but we want to express our appreciation for their presence here. I'll make a brief opening statement and then outline the rest of the course of the morning hearings.

All of us agree that we need to do more to restore excellence in education. We must increase academic achievement; we must improve attendance, reduce drop-outs and raise the graduation rate, and we must insure that when students complete their education, they have the skills necessary to enter the work force, and that meaningful jobs will be available for them which use their skills. There is no dispute about these goals, but there is real dispute about how to reach them.

We have heard a lot of hand-wringing in recent years about the poor report card that the American educational system is bringing home. But let's not overlook the high marks, too. America offers greater access to educational opportunities than any other country in the world. Other nations double-track their students, deciding at an early age those who will go on to higher education and enter the most prestigious professions, and those who will not. In America, the school-house doors stay open to any student who wishes to learn. And when it comes to higher education, a much larger percentage of young men and women go on to post-secondary education in the United States than in any other nation.

So, when we consider our grades, in providing universally available education, America excels. The hallmark of this country in education, as in so many areas, is equal opportunity. We are proud of the achievements we have made, and the successes of the past give us confidence that we can meet the challenges of the future.

Our immediate task is to enhance the quality of education while retaining its unique quality of universal availability. Our schools pride themselves as models of access, and we intend to keep them that way. And we intend to pursue our commitment to excellence.

Today's hearing will emphasize testimony on innovative ways to reach the goals we share. The types of innovation differ, but they have one thing in common: They provide incentives for accomplishing specific goals in specific periods of time. Some of these plans include financial incentives or regulatory exceptions as rewards for improving achievement scores, reducing drop-out rates and sending graduates on to college, training them for jobs, or curbing crime and vandalism in schools.

Some of these ideas are controversial, and they generate strong views on all sides of the debate. We do not necessarily endorse all of them, but we want to listen to the discussion and evaluate the record. America cannot stand still in education. We have succeeded in the past because we have been willing to be bold in our quest for excellence, to listen to new ideas and to determine what makes sense in terms of a federal role in this area.

There are parallels to the use of incentive ideas in other areas. Massachusetts has used a very successful model, the E.T. Choices Program, to move welfare beneficiaries away from dependency and into jobs. In Congress, we are already using this program as a model for national legislation to encourage states to reduce their welfare rolls.

At the same time, there is no free lunch. We face an enormous federal budget deficit, as well as severe fiscal constraints at the state and local levels. The best way to insure adequate funding for education is to demonstrate that what we buy with education dollars works, and that we are using our scarce education dollars to the maximum advantage.

This month our Senate committee is acting on legislation to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the fundamental federal aid program for the nation's public schools. We have a special opportunity through this legislation to promote the use of promising new ideas in education. I look forward to the testimony of our witnesses and to working together to find effective and affordable ways to improve the quality of American education.

These various charts indicate what the 50 states are doing in terms of innovative programs. There is quite a bit of diversity. Some states have done an evaluation of their programs, and we will hear about their goals and programs, find out what works, try to see if there are examples at the various state levels and local levels that have made some difference, and find out what application they might have on a national level. We have copies of the various charts that will be available at the door for those who would be interested in looking at them.

So, we know a lot's been going on in the states, a lot's been going on in local communities, and what we are trying to do in the course of this hearing is to find out what has been happening in the local areas, which examples has been effective, which perhaps we can accept if they are suitable for national application, and see if they cannot be replicated in perhaps some of the other hearings.

So, we will get started, and I know we have a full morning. This is an important hearing. We will ask all of our witnesses to give full statements, which will be placed in whole in the record. We want to go into the questions, so we will ask witnesses to limit the time of their presentation to five minutes. Hopefully, they will be able to do that in any way they want. They may refer obviously to the formal presentation or they can ad lib to whatever extent they want. So, we will move on now with our witnesses, and we'll ask some to appear individually, some in panels. For those that are in panels, we will from hear all the panelists before moving to the questions.

We have Chester Finn, who has been Assistant Secretary at the U.S. Department of Education since 1985. He has written and spoken widely about American education and the efforts to improve the quality of our public schools. The administration has made some specific-proposals which involve the use of incentives at various schools, and we are very interested in specific suggestions you might make. Dr. Finn.

Mr. FINN. Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. We have a reasonably expensive system here for adhering to the time limits. The Senate, as you know, has buzzers go off, lights go on. We have a somewhat more civilized system, we hold up little signs. We ask you to finish the thought that you have. We don't want to be overly arbitrary on this because we are interested in the substance, but we also recognize we have different witnesses. So, Mr. Finn.

STATEMENT OF CHESTER FINN, ASSISTANT SECRETARY, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Mr. FINN. Mr. Chairman, thanks for inviting us; thanks for holding this very important hearing. You have already said that you will enter the full text of the testimony into the record, which I appreciate. I might say it is an honor to follow Laval Wilson in this chair. I don't think there is a better big city school superintendent in the country.

The basic premise of what I have to say is that more of the same won't cure what ails the Department of Education. We need markedly better outcomes, and we are going to have to make some large changes in basic structures in centers and accountability systems in order to achieve those markedly better outcomes.

There are many promising ideas around but none more so than to open up the system so that principals and teachers and parents, and even students, can make crucial decisions for themselves and live with the consequences. Nothing so concentrates one's energy as the opportunity to make decisions for oneself and to live with the consequences of those decisions.

Please understand that I am not here describing an unregulated educational free for all. Public policy properly sets the ends for education and prescribes the goals, the standards and expectations. Public policy designs and executes that accountability system whereby we find out how well those ends are being achieved in the education system.

The CHAIRMAN. We'll see how good a witness you really are. I'm sure you can handle all questions.

Mr. FINN. As long as they are not done on my time.

Within that framework, nobody ought to be obliged to attend or to work in a school that he or she is sent to against their will, a school that might be so unpleasant or so unsuccessful that without compulsion no one would have anything to do with it. Let schools develop special characteristics and strengths and let them differ from each other. Let people make choice on the basis of those differences. Not only is this the right principle by which to operate the school of a democracy, it also makes for better schools.

Schools with choice are more effective. Kids learn more in them because the people in them want to be there; because such schools are more accountable; they have feedback, they have incentives built into them; because the educators who work in them have an opportunity for greater professionalism and greater control over crucial decisions about the means of education; because such schools can develop clear missions and a well-defined purpose, and we all know that clear missions and purposes are a key attribute of effective schools all the research that has ever been done on effective schools shows it.

This idea that I am advocating is not revolutionary, Mr. Chairman. You can go all over the country today and find thousands of schools of choice. Sometimes they are called magnet schools, some of them are called alternative schools; they go under many names. You can go to Vermont where for many years the towns that don't operate public schools have arranged to send their youngsters to other schools. You can go to District 4 in East Harlem in New York and Sy Fliegel is here today, he is one of your witnesses, to describe a superb choice program in a major section of a major metropolitan school system.

Here in Boston you can find magnet schools that are working superbly, and you will find more if Laval Wilson's plan is implemented as he proposed. In Cambridge across the river, you find a city where every elementary school in the city is a magnet school and where practically everybody gets one of their first three choices, and where enrollments have grown and test scores have risen.

You can find much the same in Acton, Massachusetts. These aren't only in big cities and urban areas. You can find them in Buffalo, you can find them in the State of Minnesota where high school students can cross district lines and can attend colleges if they have completed the high school requirements. In Maryland and in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, parents line up for three nights in advance of the day they sign up their children for the magnet school program. These are enormously popular in communities that have tried them.

In Montclair, New Jersey—an assistant for the governor of New Jersey is going to be with us this morning as well—I understand Montclair might have been the first community in the country where every school is a magnet school. There are lots of existing examples. We don't have very good aggregate data in this field, but there are at least several thousand schools of choice among the nation's 75,000 public schools today.

The idea is blossoming, too. The National Governors' Association has endorsed it, as have the Committee for Economic Development, the American Federation of Teachers, and especially the general public. In the most recent Gallup Poll, 71 percent of the public said that they would like to be able to choose the school they are going to send their children to.

Now there is still disagreement having to do with the interaction of this principle of choice with private schools, but within the boundaries of public education, I think it is fair to say that this principle has triumphed intellectually, and now it remains to be seen in how many places it will be put into practice.

The states and localities are the main engines of this change, and they should be. States can make enormous strides in this area, including choices that go across district lines. The Federal Government can encourage these things in modest ways. The magnet school program—it's steadily expanded in recent years—is one way; the new public school choice program that is incorporated into your communities' education subcommittee bill is another very promising idea.

I would like to congratulate you on this provision, Mr. Chairman, and encourage that it make its way through Congress. The administration has endorsed in principle, of course, in our re-authorization proposal for Chapter One. Let's be clear. This choice isn't the only thing to do in education, nor is it an end in itself. It is a means to fostering equal opportunity and educational quality and accountability and parent control and, incidentally, voluntary desegregation as well.

If they weren't holding up the signs saying my time has expired, I would tell you about 12 other things that I think ought to be done along with choice in order to complete the structural reform in American education that in our opinion urgently needs to be carried out.

Choice, let me say again, is a means to the ends of quality education and equal opportunity. We have to do a lot of other things as well. We are not fixated on this. We merely think it is the right way for the public schools of the United States to head in the years to come. I would thank you for the opportunity to present these views.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Finn follows:]

Testimony of Chester E. Finn, Jr.
Assistant Secretary and Counselor to the Secretary
U.S. Department of Education

before the
Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee

on

Choice and Structural Change
in American Education

October 5, 1987
Boston, Massachusetts

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I welcome the opportunity to join you here today in Boston to discuss choice in education and how the choice principle fits into the changing American educational delivery system. I testified initially on choice two years ago before the Senate Government Affairs Subcommittee. Public consciousness of choice in education has broadened significantly since that time. Today, parents recognize that the concept of choice extends well beyond the option of private school enrollment and well beyond magnet schools. The same public demands for better educational opportunities for our children that precipitated the current school reform movement continue today in most of the country; choice in education is increasingly the focus of such demands. The critical examination of our nation's schools that was spawned by the reform movement has given rise to many promising ideas for changing traditional school settings. Rewards, incentives, organizational realignments, and even sanctions, most of which were shunned by many educators and administrators just a few years ago, have become common as we attempt to ensure academic excellence and enhanced opportunities for all our school children.

I would be remiss if I failed to note the promising changes occurring in many components of the educational system in this vicinity. Many of us in Washington have watched approvingly as Laval Wilson and other Boston officials recently launched a bold and comprehensive reform to incorporate elements of choice, increased professionalism, more stringent standards, and building-level autonomy for city schools. We've also seen the Cambridge public schools successfully utilizing parental and community involvement to develop a unique choice environment. This plan broke with tradition by eliminating neighborhood attendance boundaries and creating alternatives and options for youngsters throughout the community. This has fostered better academic performance and desegregation alike. And on the state level, Massachusetts has constructed for itself one of the most ambitious assessment and feedback systems in the country, one that is producing valid achievement results that are comparable from district to district and even school to school. In addition, Massachusetts assessed its own students concurrently with the National Assessment of Educational Progress so that it could both provide school level achievement data that could be related to national performance scales and provide a basis to compare the results with those of other states.

Area officials are to be commended for these and other improvements, and it is about such improvements--and their relation to choice--that I intend to speak today. The structure of our education system is changing as a result of "excellence movement" initiatives, market factors, and political pressures. Most of the changes we are seeing are fully compatible with the principle of choice. I would like to sketch for the Committee some of these changes, suggest some additional changes not currently being pursued, then discuss how choice relates to structural change.

First, let us note that the focus of policy control in education is beginning to shift from means to ends. In the past, policymakers concentrated on educational inputs such as certification requirements, graduation requirements, hours-in-school requirements and the like. Though policymakers have not relinquished control of these factors, there has been a discernible move on their part to redirect attention to school outcomes, objective measures of learning. In Time for Results, last year's report on education by the National Governors Association, the governors agreed that they would seek ways to regulate less if schools and school districts produced better results. This has begun happening in Indiana, Washington, and North Carolina, and has been discussed in New Jersey and elsewhere.

Second, accountability is being built into the educational system at a number of levels. Taxpayers are demanding good and reliable information systems to monitor the performance of their children, and they are beginning to get such systems here in Massachusetts, in California, and elsewhere. On a nationwide scale, the administration is supporting a bill to expand the scope of the Nation's Report Card, the National Assessment of Educational Progress. When the "new NAEP" is in place, we will be able to produce valid achievement results on a state-by-state basis, and we will be able to focus on student performance in specific subjects. As a result of improved monitoring of student progress, educators, policymakers, and voters will know when they need to take action if their educational goals are not being achieved. In fact, some state lawmakers have implemented legislation to confront "educational bankruptcy." At present nine states -- Arkansas, Georgia, Illinois, Kentucky, New Jersey, New Mexico, Ohio, South Carolina, and Texas -- have laws that allow schools or school districts that prove themselves over time to be academically inferior to be annexed, so to speak, by the state and either closed or reorganized. Several other states are considering similar initiatives.

Keep in mind, too, that not all accountability efforts are aimed at students. The testing of teachers is indeed controversial, but legislators at the state level have addressed this issue, in many places, with unusual boldness. The National Teachers Exam is now required by a number of states, and many states require additional tests for both prospective and current members of the teaching force. As of this April, 48 of the 50 states had in place or were implementing some form of teacher testing. In an attempt to chronicle such activities, the Department released in August What's Happening in Teacher Testing, a collection and analysis of data on this sensitive topic.

In addition, professional educators are becoming more responsible for managing their schools. Decisions once made by distant policymakers and central offices are more properly being made by those at the school site. These decisions include ones about internal resource allocation, personnel, scheduling, and curriculum. A dramatic example of shifting responsibility is found in the agreement just reached in New York City about the operation of City schools and teacher control of decisionmaking. As a result of their new contract, New York City teachers will not only get significant pay increases, but will also be able to challenge central board regulations concerning class size, curriculum content, and choice of textbooks. Also, teachers who feel they are losing professional competence will be able to obtain help from more experienced teachers, known as "intervenors."

In conjunction with school site autonomy, teachers and administrators are being encouraged through various incentive and reward systems to provide better leadership and to produce improved results. Tennessee, Georgia, Arkansas and a number of other states are moving forward in the adoption of career ladder plans wherein competent, ambitious teachers can increase their status and pay by demonstrating competence over time. At the same time, school boards are recognizing the need for committed, enthusiastic, capable leaders to assume the role of principal, and they are beginning to search for such individuals. Accordingly, principals' institutes have been established to train prospective principals in the art of leadership. The Department is also trying to enhance such leadership-oriented moves. This summer we released a Principal Selection Guide to help local boards search for good leaders, and we are also producing for release in early 1989 a casebook for use in training school principals.

Though these changes are beginning to take place, other non-incremental changes need to occur before learning levels are apt to increase significantly. More extensive use needs to be made of alternative certification to get qualified individuals from diverse backgrounds into the field of teaching. Technology needs to be used more efficiently and creatively. The school calendar needs to be rewritten, as well, and parents need to become more active partners in the educational enterprise. Further suggestions for change have been made by American Federation of Teachers President Al Shanker, who has recommended implementing a national teacher exam to certify the quality of teachers, and developing professional teacher boards, at both the district and state levels, to develop standards of academic and ethical behavior, as well as to handle parental complaints, monitor instructional materials, and deal with incompetent teachers. And Ted Sizer is actually experimenting with structural changes through the Coalition of Essential Schools, a network of schools working toward greater teacher control of educational decisions.

The addition of choice options in education is, of course, a vitally important structural change, one which meshes neatly with the aforementioned changes. Let me talk about choice a bit and relate it to the evolving education system.

When I testified before a Senate subcommittee on this topic in the fall of 1985, I reviewed the state of the research, and what we know about education choice. My conclusion then as now, on the basis of research, is that choice favorably affects student achievement; that a well-designed choice program is useful in achieving racial desegregation goals; and that public school choice programs appear to improve the vitality of public education. At the same time, the research uniformly fails to support the critics' contentions that more choice would reduce student achievement, torpedo desegregation goals or ruin public education. Let me recount briefly some major research findings on choice that have appeared since my 1985 testimony.

John Chubb and Terry Moe, at the Brookings Institution, have continued their analysis of the High School and Beyond data base, and their own supplementary Administrator-Teacher Survey. Some of their findings have been published; more are due out soon. These researchers continue to find certain private school advantages, especially in "clarity and homogeneity of educational purpose". They continue to believe that the public schools can emulate the private schools given well-designed structural changes in the public school system that would permit greater school autonomy. They also find that successful public schools have more of the organizational attributes of private schools -- strong leadership, parental support and participation, clear goals, team play, and freedom from an overbearing bureaucracy.

In 1986 Mary Anne Raywid, of Hofstra University's Center for the Study of Educational Alternatives, argued that schools of choice in the public sector possessed various "success dynamics." First, choice is of value to our society in and of itself, engendering freedom and broadening possibilities for all. In short, choice is something we need to be teaching children, and what better way to do so than through the school structure itself. Second, choice improves teaching by making it easier to assemble classrooms of reasonably like-minded students, thus improving the likelihood of educational success. Third, choice breaks down bureaucratic controls of schools by discouraging uniformity, which lends itself to centralized regulation. Fourth, choice encourages educator collaboration, which in turn encourages excellence like that found in many types of organizations and identified by Thomas Peters and Robert Waterman. Fifth, through the school restructuring it engenders, choice encourages the "personalization" of education; strengths of both teachers and students will be better used toward educational ends. And sixth, choice tends to make schools self-renewing systems, primarily by providing immediate feedback and incentives through the other success dynamics.

In addition to relatively large scale empirical studies, there is a marvelous hubbub of activity focusing on education choice coming from the academic community, some of which has been supported by the Department. Richard Elmore, for example, as part of the activity funded through one of our centers (The Center for Policy Research in Education), has prepared a key essay on choice. John McClaughry, with a grant from the Secretary's Discretionary Fund, has produced a scholarly, historical, and current picture of the Vermont system of education choice -- a system that has worked well for more than a century.

Other Department-funded research on choice is worth noting. The

Department supported a case study evaluation of outstanding public school choice programs. One of the sites, in New York District 4, was recently featured on the McNeil-Lehrer show. Charles Glenn, director of the Bureau of Equal Opportunity for the state education department here in Massachusetts, has undertaken a study of schools of choice in other countries. At my request the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development requested its member nations to prepare papers on the status of education choice in their respective countries. We have now contracted with Dr. Glenn to synthesize these papers and expect additional insights into choice as a result of these international comparisons. Also in the area of international choice, Estelle James is continuing her work on public and private school choice abroad. An unrelated study partially funded by the Department and worth mentioning: Christine Rossell of Boston University conducted a study and found that desegregation programs that rely on choice tend to produce more lasting effects. Finally, the Office of Educational Research and Improvement is developing a "parents' guide" to making educational choices for children.

A large amount of other work has proceeded independently -- a development that I applaud. The Minnesota Options Plan has not only been implemented, but the state has undertaken an evaluation of the results that has revealed parental and student satisfaction with the program and strong levels of academic achievement on the part of participants. In Time for Results, the National Governors Association gave a strong endorsement of choice. In its 1987 follow-up report, it has collected anecdotal information on choice initiatives throughout the country. Academic journals and the popular education press abound with stories, opinions and commentary on the topic. Again, we support such investigations.

Though researchers continue to debate about the desirability of choice, the public continues its support of the notion. In the 1987 Gallup Poll on Education, sponsored by Phi Delta Kappa, fully 71% of all respondents said "yes" when asked if parents should have a right to choose the local public school their children attend. Gallup Polls from previous years indicate that this support is longstanding, too. There is also polling evidence of a widespread desire for education choice among minorities. The Gallup Poll consistently shows Blacks and residents of our largest cities in favor of education vouchers. This leads us to but one conclusion: those who want more educational choice tend to be those who presently enjoy it the least.

Poll evidence is convincing, but each spring we see enthusiasm for choice played out in the newspapers as parents flock to magnet schools and wait in line -- often for hours or even days -- to enroll their children in quality programs. Last February, for example, the Associated Press reported on a group of Pittsburgh parents who spent several winter days in a parking lot awaiting the opportunity to sign up their children for a local magnet school. Prince Georges County, Maryland has a number of magnet schools, and Washingtonians annually watch as parents almost fight for slots in these schools. Such scenes are relatively common across the country in places where even a limited choice scheme is in effect.

We at the Department would like to see choice extended such that parents and children are able to select the school they want to attend anywhere in the district, or, even better, anywhere in the state. We also think teachers and principals should be able to choose which school they wish to work in. We do so at least in part because there are four key themes that underlie the choice concept, themes we think are borne out by research and are worth noting:

-- First, choice fosters equality of opportunity. Currently, wealthy families may choose private schools or may move to districts that have good public schools; poorer families by and large do not have such options. This inequity often leads to poor educational achievement among those with fewer options. Inequities of this sort could be addressed through choice arrangements, since choice usually leads to greater academic achievement among minority and low-income students.

-- Second, choice of schools by students, teachers, and administrators might provide enough competition to bring substantial improvement in program quality and in educator responsiveness to parents. Competition will also engender diversity, which we believe is inherently preferable to uniformity, homogeneity, and monopoly.

-- Third, a choice system allows for the proper functioning of the parental right to shape the education of the child. Many today believe that public schools convey majoritarian beliefs, values, and philosophies or homogenized orthodoxy that lose sight of other values and distinctive beliefs. Worse yet, schools fearful of offending parents who hold views and beliefs outside of the majority often do not attempt to teach values at all. Choice would create a variety of types of schools; the school system as a whole, therefore, would be more responsive to the desires of families.

-- Finally, choice will lead toward greater school-level autonomy, which will enhance teacher professionalism, encourage educators to be responsive to parents, and combat the detrimental effects on school quality of increased centralization of education policy.

Given the needed addition of the principle of choice to the evolving structure of the educational system, we will certainly be in for some radical change. But we ought not fear this. The status quo isn't working well enough. Serious efforts at education reform require these non-incremental changes. Let me be clear: I am not speaking here of change just for the sake of change. Some of the structural changes I've mentioned are already occurring. Choice -- a structural change not now being made in enough places -- _is_ educationally functional. The effective schools research clearly suggests how various types of choice on the part of parents, teachers, and administrators works to build good schools. The study of other organizations also shows how decentralization, local autonomy, and choice mesh to create strong institutions. Common sense, too, tells us this. And finally, an examination of places where choice has been tried and found to work show how the right kinds of incentives, rewards, and alternatives in a system lead to gains in productivity.

Let me recap the ways I believe education will benefit from all the structural changes I've discussed. First, teachers will become more "professional" in a number of ways. With increased school level autonomy, career ladders, increased accountability, choice of schools for students and teachers, educators will become less dependent on centralized authorities. An infusion of choice into the system will also increase parental involvement significantly. Further, schools will begin to develop different emphases. Some will focus on the arts, some on science, some on math, and the like, though there will be a core of basic knowledge that will be taught at each institution. Desegregation efforts will be enhanced, and those who now have the least say in their education will benefit the most.

CONCLUSION

In parting, Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend you for holding this hearing and for your search for better ways to educate our children. Let me encourage you to make choice a focus of your deliberations on our educational difficulties. I am here to suggest that choice in education is probably *the* most effective means to our mutually desired goal of increasing achievement levels of all our students.

The **Chairman**. Thank you very much. What do you think the Federal Government might do to encourage more innovation and reform at the local school level? I think you made an impressive case for what's being done, a lot of those programs are being started, and you make a very impressive statement in support of those, and I am interested in what you are prepared to do or recommend for Congress so that this kind of innovation can take place, and we can at least get this kind of support.

Mr. **Finn**. Well, sir, we have proposed an expansion in Chapter One and a change in Chapter One so the program would be more accountable, so it will have more choice built into it, and so that it would have more feedback as to whether programs are working and succeeding.

We have also proposed some modifications of Chapter Two, which is the most flexible form of money the states and localities have, and we have proposed expansions of the magnet schools program which is probably the most demonstrable existing form of federally supported choice of the elementary-secondary.

You have in your subcommittee draft bill not only the choice program just alluded to, but also a fund for the improvement of elementary and secondary education, which is a superb idea, in order to allow innovative demonstration of high quality programs across the country. And though the sums are small——

The **Chairman**. What is the funding level of the innovative program?

Mr. **Finn**. As I recall, the new one is under the 15 million dollar range at the outset for the funds for the improvement program, and the choice program is another ten to 20 million dollars, if my memory serves me right from reading the draft bill. These are small, but they are very significant symbolically when you combine them with what the states and localities are already doing and seeking some small help with doing.

The **Chairman**. I think we can differ about the nature of that type of funding and commitment on it, but that isn't the purpose of these hearings. Talk for a minute about the national assessment and what you think are the advantages in terms of reviews, the successes in the states.

Mr. **Finn**. Yes, sir.

The **Chairman**. The current administration is somewhat different from our proposal to do it by state, but what do you think would be the advantages of that type of administration?

Mr. **Finn**. This is a major administration proposal, and the version that we set up is certainly first cousin of the version you have submitted to the Senate, and we appreciate that; national assessment, known as NAEP, is the closest thing there is today of a national report card as to how the nation's schools are doing today as a whole. The problem is that when we refer to our nation as a whole, we don't do much good for governors and legislatures and chief state school officers and people who want to know how are the children of Tennessee doing as compared to the nation as a whole, or how the children of Massachusetts are doing in comparison with children in New Hampshire.

And we have proposed that national subjects be expanded so that there would be state by state information at three crucial grade levels and in about eight crucial subject areas every two years, and this is a legitimate role of the Federal Government under the headings of accountability and information and feedback with information. With information, people can know how they are doing. When they know how they are doing, they can decide whether they want to do it differently. There is a very important change pending before your committee, and an initial funding for it is always pending before the Appropriations Committee as well.

The **Chairman**. Okay. We'll be hearing some information from later witnesses on a number of programs with reference to that, and we look forward to reviewing those 12 other recommendations. We want to thank you very much. We have got to be moving, as you know, that authorization through. We are going to be evaluating the kinds of information and recommendations you make here. We want to work with the administration on the programs that do offer some degree and hope of achieving the common objectives, and so we will look forward to working with you.

Mr. **Finn**. Thank you, sir. We look forward to cooperating in this matter as well.

The **Chairman**. Our next group of witnesses will appear as a panel. Dr. Richard Mills is special assistant for education to Governor Kean of New Jersey. Governor Kean was the former chairman of the National Governor's Association education subcommittee. Francis Keppel of the Harvard School of Education, and former U.S. Commissioner of Education, appeared before our Committee a number of different times in the five years I have been on this Committee. Dr. Dorothy Jones, Director of the Desegregation/Integration Office, Cambridge Public Schools; and Mr. Sy Fliegel, who is the Deputy Superintendent of Community School District 4 in New York City.

We will start with Mr. Mills.

STATEMENTS OF DR. RICHARD MILLS, SPECIAL ASSISTANT FOR EDUCATION TO GOVERNOR KEAN OF NEW JERSEY; FRANCIS KEPPEL, HARVARD SCHOOL OF EDUCATION; DOROTHY JONES, DIRECTOR, DESEGREGATION INTEGRATION, CAMBRIDGE PUBLIC SCHOOLS; AND SY FLIEGEL, DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT OF COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT 4

Dr. **Mills**. Senator, I am deeply honored to be here, and especially in such company. Governor Kean asked me to express his appreciation to you for holding these hearings, and also to the people of East Boston for being our hosts.

I think you are absolutely right in leading this search for incentives. We simply need far more of them than we have. But there really is not and never will be a final list of incentives that we all should adopt. I think what counts is the attitude you are demonstrating here today—that and what you do in the full committee in Washington.

Because, quite frankly, the search for the incentives has to be continuous, and whether we are at the state or federal or local level, in this matter we have the same work to do. I have seen incentives working in the local schools I described in my written testimony. I have seen incentives in the states, and it is good to see the Governors' reports on these charts in front of us.

In my state, New Jersey, we are very tough on schools that simply continue to tolerate failure, but it is the incentives, I think, that made us an education state. Some examples: We have a basic schools program which increases state aid to school districts when they increase the number of students meeting state standards.

Twenty-eight hundred teachers have received the Governor's award for outstanding teaching. Each shared a day of convocation with the governor, and each received a thousand dollar award. We have a co-operative school project that puts unions, boards, teachers, and administrators together to build alternatives to the very combative environment and that characterizes too many schools.

The CHAIRMAN. Just hold for a minute—I would like to welcome the students who have just arrived here. What we are basically talking about is various recommendations and innovations to strengthen the quality of education in our school system. We have a panel here of individuals who have worked on this over a very long period of time, and they are telling us, the Committee I represent, what they are going to try and do at the national level. This panel has worked in this area in the state and local communities.

They are telling us what has been successful, and we take that, evaluate it, and try to make it available nationwide. That is basically what we are talking about. Thank you.

Dr. MILLS. Thank you, Senator. I want to cite one other example. We have a voluntary five day basic skills institute that provides very detailed analysis of specific skills that students miss on the graduation test. People who participate in those institutes leave with plans that they develop themselves to turn the situation around, and we have found that the students deliver. The scores on those tests have really gone up in an impressive way in the last year.

What I want to talk about with the rest of my time is not what is happening in the states, but the opportunity, Senator, that is before you. I really see three opportunities, which I've described in my written testimony but I want to speak about just one. It concerns students at risk, and I think the arena is the one you mentioned, the rewriting of Chapter One.

Let me give you the elements of Governor Kean's idea in this area. He says let's simply concentrate more Chapter One funds in schools with the greatest concentrations of low achieving, poor students. Then let's offer some performance grants to schools in that group that raise student achievement, and let's do everything we possibly can to make it happen, to make it possible for them to win those performance grants.

I mean simplify regulation. I mean provide small start-up funds. But I think the engine that could drive this entire thing would be an educational leadership consortium. It would be a nationwide training effort. A joint venture between federal, state and local authorities. All the districts, all the schools striving for the performance grants would be part of this leadership consortium. The purpose would be to train school leaders and school teachers in the strategies we know will work. The local school would help decide what training is needed. Many state, federal and local authorities would help deliver the training. It would be practical. It would be as close to the school as possible. It could even be a state option. But States that choose to do this ought to be able to reallocate a small portion of the basic grant as an award to schools that use this new knowledge to boost achievement.

There are several incentives in this. The training itself is one. High performing corporations in this country get to be that way because they invest in their people. And the fact of the matter is that many schools simply can't afford to do that.

I think the probability of success is another incentive. We condemn failing schools in this country, but we almost never offer a real lever for them to help themselves. But the big incentive is the connection between performance and additional financial support. Turning around a failing school is very, very difficult, but there are people who know how to do it; in fact many of them are here in this room.

Why don't we help those people systematically apply improvement strategies? We invest in this country in renewing our industry. Why not invest in renewing the people who teach? It is not enough to favor education spending and to favor accountability, as if these are separate things. What counts is the link between the two.

Now, this school leadership consortium is not in the committee draft on Chapter One. On behalf of Governor Kean, I urge you to be its champion. Let a few states show that this can be done. If that opportunity is presented to us, New Jersey will seize that opportunity, and I am confident that others will, too. Thank you very much for this opportunity to address the committee.

[The prepared statement of Dr. Mills follows:]

IN SEARCH OF INCENTIVES

Testimony of Richard P. Mills
Office of Governor Thomas H. Kean
State of New Jersey

before the
United States Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee

on
Incentives in Education

October 5, 1987

> "Nothing is more powerful than positive reinforcement. Everybody uses it. But top performers, almost alone, use it extensively... They actively seek out and pursue endless excuses to give out rewards."(1)

Peters and Waterman wrote that about high performing business operations, but a similar tale could be told of high performing schools. It isn't hard to collect examples. In Paramus, New Jersey one day's visit revealed these:

- Paramus High School has a program for high school students considered at risk of dropping out. Instead of being hidden in a remote facility, their classes meet in the district's showcase that houses administration, the adult center, and an art exhibit. They had been writing most of the morning, but the visitor found them working in the television studio. They were preparing to make a videotape from each of the scripts they had written, and they were using the district's new video equipment.
- The administrators talked at length about two particularly skilled teachers and then made them the main spokespersons for the program, and gave them all the credit for the program's evident success. Everyone deferred to the teachers and their explanation.
- One student who had been in academic difficulty had recently revealed an unexpected artistic gift. The school arranged for art instruction and exhibited one of his paintings in a professional manner.

What was going on there? The visitor had simply been invited to see a good school in operation. No one said "Here is our incentive program." They probably weren't really aware that they had one. But incentives and rewards seemed part of everything they did. In both open and subtle ways, the teachers and students were being told that their work is noticed and valued.

They were being entrusted with important tasks. They were being told that results, and not just effort, matters. And they were given the time, equipment and flexibility to do the job.

Incentives reflect the conviction that most people really want to do a good job, and they expect to be empowered to do it. Most of us want to be recognized appropriately for achievement. People who dream up incentives think that building commitment and tapping energy in others is important. And a lot of people watching the schools think they are right.

The nation's governors have long argued the case for more incentives in education. In their Time for Results report, recommendation after recommendation stressed words such as encourage, reward and recognize.(2) For example, the governors proposed incentives to reinvent the school for better performance. Reward school principals and schools that do a better job for the students, they said. Provide the technical advice needed to help other schools get that recognition. The governors proposed a really significant incentive, given today's highly structured education system, when they offered to trade less regulation for more performance.

In A Nation Prepared the members of the Carnegie Forum Task Force on Teaching as a Profession were particularly drawn to incentives.(3) Their starting point was the idea that Americans must be fundamentally better educated than they are today or acquiesce to a lower standard of living. They saw that only by making teaching more attractive and effective could we achieve that.

One can read virtually the entire Carnegie Forum report as a structure of related incentives. For example, the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards will give teachers an opportunity to demonstrate knowledge and capacity on a par with other professions. The recommendations on recruiting minorities to teaching are a system of incentives. The recommendations on teacher salary would reward teachers in part for what the children in their care actually learn.

A Louis Harris Survey on the reaction to the Carnegie Forum recommendations revealed that 93 percent of the public and an identical proportion of the nation's senior business leaders favored creating incentives "to focus the schools' entire energies on improving student performance."(4)

The common theme is, of course, performance. How do we measure it fairly in schools, and how do we boost it, especially for children in greatest need? The search for incentives results from these troubling questions and the recognition that free societies quickly reach the limits of what they can accomplish by directive and standardization.

This testimony describes some recent state experiences with incentives in education and then presents three suggestions for federal action.

The state experience with incentives

The states have had long experience with incentives. Governor Kean's New Jersey Design for Educational Excellence includes these incentives:(5)

- Increased starting salary for teachers to $18,500 to attract qualified teachers.
- The Governor's Teaching Scholars Program provides scholarship loans of up to $7,500 per year to prospective teachers. The loans will be forgiven to students who complete a specified period of teaching in the state's schools.
- The Governor's Award for Outstanding Teaching provides a $1,000 grant to the teachers selected locally to meet standards of excellence. The teachers select and oversee the use of the grant for some educational purpose. Over 2,800 teachers have received these Awards and taken part in a day long convocation with Governor Kean.
- Teacher Grants of $15,000 each to teachers who develop effective classroom strategies.
- The Basic Skills Improvement Program will reward school districts that increase the number of students meeting state basic skills standards. Those districts will receive additional state aid to enrich their basic skills programs.
- 10,000 Jobs for 10,000 Graduates will offer jobs to high school students who pass the state graduation test and complete employability skills courses.
- State Monitoring relieves school districts of state inspections and considerable reporting requirements for five years if they meet rigorous performance standards.
- The Cooperative Schools Project involves 9 districts in which unions, boards, teachers and administrators have agreed to jointly examine problems in the organizational climate of the school and resolve those problems together. The project is designed to encourage alternatives to the combative environment that characterizes too many schools.

Other states have their own versions of these and other incentive systems.(6) Two other ideas, parental choice and teacher incentive pay, are usually topics that stand alone if only because of the controversy they engender, but they are well developed incentive systems that deserve mention here.

Choice systems create powerful incentives for school administrators, parents, teachers and students. They can reshape virtually every element of the school. Because the incentives are so powerful, choice marshals strong arguments on both sides. But the idea has deep roots in both desegregation and school quality movements. Experience is accumulating fast and Massachusetts is clearly a leader.(7)

With all the controversy, a few things seem undeniable. Choice offers no guarantee of quality. But virtually all observers note that schools have to change. Choice systems offer proven ways to accomplish this change under certain conditions. But three factors of the current school reform movement make choice especially interesting. As teaching becomes more of a profession, as we create more sophisticated measures of how well schools perform, and as the public becomes more sophisticated about the goals of education, state and local authorities will find themselves offering more and more choice options. As that happens, we will all be glad of the Massachusetts leadership in this area.

Teacher performance pay also has a long history. A recent proponent is Iowa which this year committed nearly $100 million to a three-part program to raise starting salaries, provide a general increase in all teacher salaries, and a performance based pay system. Governor Branstad's plan enables local school committees to devise a performance pay system but each school district receives a share of the state performance pay funds only after a state commission reviews and approves the local plan.

There are strong views on both sides of the performance pay idea, too. Opponents distrust administrators' judgements, cite inadequate performance appraisals and poor understanding of what motivates teachers. Supporters counter with the hard to answer arguments that money motivates, and that teachers, like all workers, differ in what they do and how well they do it.(8)

Interest in performance pay remains high for many of the same reasons that keep choice systems alive: the obvious need to improve the way schools work, the growing potential to make teaching a true profession, and the gradual appearance of better ways to measure school performance. And again, a few things seem clear among the conflicting arguments: Collaborative designs work better than imposed systems. Listening to what teachers think is essential.

The Federal Opportunity

What are the opportunities for federal incentives? In early 1987, the National Governors' Association summarized the governors' experience with school reform in a set of policy statements intended to assist the Congress as it began work on reauthorization of Chapter 1. In that statement of principles was this:

> "Help us reward performance. Governors want to provide incentives to schools and districts that increase student achievement. Provide federal funds for this purpose too..."(9)

Here are three incentives that merit federal support. One concerns students at risk, the second supports teaching as a profession and a third addresses performance of the entire education system.

1. Rewriting Chapter 1 for Performance

Congressional renewal of Chapter 1 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Improvement Act presents a major opportunity to devise incentives for better schools. Governor Tom Kean of New Jersey proposed such incentives last May in testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Arts, Education and the Humanities.(10) Governor Kean's proposal was part of an appeal to gradually concentrate Chapter 1 funds over a period of some years into schools with the greatest concentrations of low achieving, poor students.

The Kean proposal would offer districts in the greatest need an opportunity to win large performance grants when they improved student achievement. And it would do everything possible to help those local districts achieve those results. For example, the proposal calls for schoolwide improvement plans, continuous training of professional staff, small start-up grants and state monitoring of results. States would administer sanctions for grossly ineffective school programs. The entire focus would be on local responsibility. The additional funds - the performance grants - would flow only to those schools that improved student performance.

The training feature of the Kean proposal bears special mention. Governor Kean called for a joint venture between state, local and federal leaders to establish a nationwide training network. It would be called a School Leadership Consortium, and all districts taking part in the concentration program would become part of the Consortium. The Consortium's purpose would be to train school leaders and teachers in strategies likely to improve student achievement.

State, federal and local leaders would collaborate to develop the training program. Assessments of local training needs, jointly conducted by the state and local authorities, would precede the training to make sure that content would be really useful in a particular school. The Consortium would offer training for superintendents, board members, administrators and teachers.

Training would be continuous as the schools developed their improvement plans and put them in place. If the school raised student achievement and received a performance grant, the training would intensify to enable teachers and administrators to make the most effective use of these new funds.

The incentives associated with the Consortium would appear in several forms. The training itself would be an incentive for many. Experienced teachers often note that they have very few opportunities for professional renewal. The performance grant would be a major incentive to the entire district. And finally, consider the situation of a school board and administration with extra time, fewer regulations, lots of training that still could not deliver the funds to their district. It may be that in some communities, people can look the other way when children drop out or even graduate without skills. But everyone will notice when the funds don't arrive, and they will ask why. This certainty will also be an incentive.

This nationwide network would reach perhaps 300 of the schools whose students were in the greatest need of help. It would cost approximately $15 million.

2. Professional Standards as Incentives

The National Board of Professional Teaching Standards emerged last May. In the months since, the original board has searched for the members to complete its full compliment under the bylaws. Two thirds of the members will be teachers, including state, federal and local leaders of the unions, the subject area associations and other distinguished teachers. The other members are elected officials, including Governor Kean, business leaders and other citizens who share the belief that teaching must become in fact a profession.

Although it was established only months ago, the Board is already one year into an exacting research agenda that will enable it to define a set of professional certificates and a way to assess whether candidates meet the nationwide standards.

Four or five years will pass before the Board can complete the initial stage of its design work and offer certificates. But shortly thereafter, the certificates will become a mark of distinction. Teacher educators will make sure that their graduates have the foundation needed to eventually earn the certificate. Programs that cannot demonstrate this will wither. Many school boards will cite the proportion of their teachers who are certified and will vigorously recruit such teachers. Administrators will have to redesign the way schools work if they hope to keep such teachers. Teachers will have at hand a means to build their professional stature without having to leave the teaching profession to do it. For all these reasons, the

National Board for Professional Teaching Standards will provide a powerful set of incentives.

The development costs will be high over the next five years, and are expected to total $50 million. A one time federal grant to underwrite a significant portion of this cost would be a sound investment.

3. Reliable Performance Data as an Incentive

In short order, the nation has gone from governors asserting it's *Time for Results* to a discussion of just what results we want and need. Several recent studies including those by E.D. Hirsch, the National Assessment for Educational Progress, and Chester Finn and Dianne Ravitch have probed what young Americans should know but do not.

So many observers of the American school call for more professional autonomy, less top down regulation, more creativity, and it is an attractive vision. But we cannot heed the call without better measures of results. Without comprehensive, reliable measures we cannot know when it's working without watching closely. And when things go wrong, we must rely too heavily on guesswork and direct intervention to take corrective actions.

Recent experience with the New Jersey High School Proficiency Test offers an illustration of the potential of a good set of performance data. The test in mathematics, reading and writing must be passed for graduation. Schools that do not enable their students to perform to certain levels will not achieve state certification, and that invites many undesirable interactions with state authorities. Each year, parents, students, teachers and administrators receive detailed information about test results. The New Jersey Department of Education offers 5 day Institutes to teachers and administrators to provide very detailed analysis of specific skills and even test items that students miss. Participants leave with corrective strategies that they developed themselves. As a result, districts have examined their curricula, adjusted schedules and worked hard to improve student achievement. The students delivered this year; test scores rose dramatically.

There are many new studies of education performance indicators now in progress, and some of them are supported by the federal government. The proposal to expand the National Assessment of Educational Progress to permit state comparisons and measurement of more sophisticated skills would cost $26 million. That also would be a good investment.

A Final Word

Educators rely on long tradition when they parse out different roles for local, state and federal authorities. But the search for incentives can largely ignore such boundaries. American education simply needs far more incentives for performance than it has now. The schools must get better than they are. There will be no final list of incentives for all to adopt. As Peters and Waterman suggested, the search for incentives must be continuous. We need a new attitude on the part of people at all levels, an attitude of watchfulness for the opportunities at hand, a predisposition to be inventive and to act.

The three federal opportunities - the Chapter 1 Reauthorization, the creation of the National Board and the expansion of the National Assessment - have these common elements. They are opportunities to link dollars to performance and to unleash the talents and energies of countless Americans who are committed to better education. They represent the best kind of investment.

NOTES

1. Thomas H. Peters and Robert H. Waterman, Jr. In Search of Excellence. New York: Harper and Row, 1982.

2. National Governors' Association, Time for Results. Washington, D.C. 1986.

3. The Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, A Nation Prepared. The Report of the Task Force on Teaching as a Profession. Washington, D.C. 1986.

4. Louis Harris, Redesigning America's Schools: The Public Speaks. Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy 1986, p. 16.

5. New Jersey Department of Education, New Jersey's Design for Educational Excellence: Into Action. Trenton, New Jersey, Department of Education, December 1986.

6. Results in Education: 1987. Washington, D.C.: The National Governors' Association, July 1987.

7. Charles L. Glenn, Family Choice and Public Schools; A Report to the State Board of Education. Quincy, Massachusetts: The Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Department of Education, January 1986.

8. Cresap, McCormick and Paget, Teacher Incentives; A Tool for Effective Management. Washington, D.C.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, National Association of Elementary School Principals and the American Association of Schools Administrators, 1984, p.8.

   Samuel B. Bacharach, David B. Lipshy, Joseph B. Shield, Pay for Better Teaching: Merit Pay and its Alternatives. Ithaca, New York: Organizational Analysis and Practice, Inc. 1984, p. 4.

9. 1987 Amendments to National Governors' Association Policies.

10. Honorable Thomas H. Kean, Testimony before the United States Senate on Reauthorization of Chapters 1 and 2. Washington, D.C.: Subcommittee on education, Arts and Humanities, Committee on Labor and Human Resources, May, 1987.

The **Chairman**. Thank you very much. I have questions, but I think we will hear from the whole panel first.

Mr. **Keppel**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm glad that I follow Rick Mills, because he has already made the point that I wanted to make, but he didn't make it directly. My point is that 25 years ago, which is when I first came before your committee, there were two major differences: one, the governors, the state political leaders, the state educators want to do something. That was not as clear to me 25 years ago as it is now. It's been true for 10 or 15 years that the leadership of the United States, by and large in the states, want education reform. And I think what Rick has just said, sir, tends to make that case.

Second, compared to 25 years ago, we didn't have then any evidence that was dependable about how much students were learning. Indeed, Senator Robert Kennedy helped very much get that going years ago. We now are well down the road, as Mr. Finn just pointed out, to getting data: data over time showing trend lines of different ages of students and different subjects, science and math and so forth. From these facts I draw the following four conclusions:

The first is that all the data shows, in particular, data of the last ten years, that while there has been improvements in student learning from the 9-year-old to 13-year-old, there has not been in the 17-year-olds particularly in the math and science.

To me this leads to shifting incentives in Title One—I'm sorry, Chapter One—Title One, to include the high school, I believe you are already going to do that.

Second, we know some schools in some parts of the nation within states are doing very badly. Please note, I am not saying the *system*, I'm saying the *schools*. We can now get to the point where we can make comparisons of schools but, above all, by this method of national assessments, NAEP, we can get information over time on progress or decline in individual schools.

It seems to me the incentives should be used to encourage the states to move into planning systems to take over failing schools, and I urge the committee to consult the chief state school officers to get detailed programs on which the Senate decision might be based.

Third, there is a lot of talk about school teachers, Senator, but nobody is actively recruiting minority teachers for the next decade, and I believe that, too, can be a source of an incentive program.

And finally, I was delighted to hear Chester Finn refer to competitive—competition as a motive for school improvement. In fact, I was glad to discover that the present administration has discovered Title One after a little while. We don't have a level playing field now. The decision by the states get comparative data out of NAEP will now in due course move down to the schools the usual way. That will provide a basis for a fair competitive reporting system, which we don't have now.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Keppel follows:]

Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resource

Boston, Massachusetts

October 5, 1987

Testimony of Francis Keppel
Senior Lecturer on Education, Harvard University
United States Commissioner of Education, 1962-1966

My suggestions for the Committee's consideration grow out of my estimate of key national developments effecting American education on which the Committee might rely in building incentives for improved performance. It is almost a quarter century since I first had the privilege of testifying before your Committee as President Kennedy's Commissioner of Education, and I hope that you will allow me to use those years as the context of this testimony.

(1) It is now clear that federal incentives that focus attention on national problems improve school performance. The best evidence is the result of the original Title 1 of the ESEA of 1965 for disadvantaged children and the program for handicapped children. Neither of these programs existed a quarter century ago. Most of the present Chapter 1 funds are focused on elementary schools and National Association of Educational Progress (NAEP) data shows that pupil performance is improving, perhaps because of the money, but also probably because the program itself was the incentive that brought local attention to a national problem.

I suggest that the Committee may conclude from this experience that one can not expect quick results, that there is no best way for all schools to see the best results, and that therefore, local flexibility be rewarded. But most important today, the national problem, also shown by NAEP data, has shifted to the high school level, and to near crisis situations in some cities. I therefore urge that Chapter 1 be expanded to put the focus and the incentives on the high school in the disadvantaged areas of the cities, and attach to the legislation specific incentive programs for students with particular needs: drop outs, teenage parents. In this connection I attach some specific suggestions on programs that might be encouraged.

(2) Compared to the early 1960's, the Governors of the states, the state legislatures and economic leaders in the states are far more concerned with the need for better school performance. The development is not transitory: it has been going on for a decade and a half, and is politically bi-partisan. Where once the problem was to get the states' attention to school problems, the opportunity today is to use incentives to help the states to reach their goals. This suggests that federal incentives can now be used to help states achieve their goals, and that the use of state plans as a mechanism, which did not seem to me particularly successful twenty-five years ago, may work now.

Two opportunities that might benefit from federal incentives and awards result from recent actions by Governors and chief state school officers. The first is the Governors' concern with city schools that would appear to be in very serious trouble. The words "bankruptcy" and "disaster" are sometimes used, and not without reason. Pupils do not seem to be either learning or behaving, teacher morale has eroded, public support is hard to find, but there is no lack of political blame. As the Committee knows the Governors in effect proposed a mechanism that might be compared to bankruptcy. Drastic changes in management would be involved. And, as has been shown recently in New Jersey, there are political difficulties. The issue, of course, is that everyone seems to be punished -- pupils, teacher, administrators, policy makers -- even if perhaps unfairly, and there seems to be no way to reward improvement.

In this connection, the Committee may wish to explore a model for state legislation being explored by the Chief State School Officers, which would identify particular schools, not school districts, which on the basis of achievement test scores are showing low and declining scores by pupils, and which suffer from poverty, high drop out rates. If identified, each school would be required to propose a method to get out of its troubles, a plan which I hope would require teacher participation at all stages. The goal would be to reduce the percentage of children found to be "at risk" in the school by 5% annually. If after the first few years this goal was not met, a variety of remedial steps would be authorized, ranging from parental right to move to another school to formal administrative reviews and action at higher levels. The value of these ideas, as I see it, is to put the school, not the district, at the center of change; to make teachers central to planned change; to increase rewards where possible rather than rely on punishment.

The Committee may wish to inquire in detail as to these ideas from David Hornbeck, the Chairman of the Chief State School Officers. It may be that the Federal Government could devise a program of incentives that would help the states to grapple with the crisis of education in many cities by providing dollar incentives to schools, identified by the states as in serious trouble, to work their way out of trouble. Presumably, such a program should be a matching program with the states and should be limited to only those schools where pupils and teachers are at the gravest learning and social risk. Something clearly needs to be done, for the problem is getting worse. It is a national problem, but one that has to be managed by state government. And state governments evidently want to do something.

(3) State governments have also begun to take on the problem of teacher numbers and teacher quality, as a part of the general issue of school reform. These problems, of course, were high on the list of worries a quarter of a century ago, but it was hard to find a "handle". The creation since then of Chapter 1 schools and the creation of a system of student financial aid, and especially Pell Grants and work study programs, seem to me to provide the structure that is needed for the federal government to provide incentives to state programs to deal with the most serious national issues of recruitment and training of teachers.

There is some current dispute about the existence and possible severity of an overall "teaching shortage" in the coming decades. But there is little dispute about the probable shortage of certain types of teachers, especially minority teachers and teachers of science and mathematics. The Carnegie Report on Teachers for the 21st Century estimates the need for the recruitment and preparation of 50,000 minority teachers annually "to seek a rough equivalence" among new teachers for the minority 25 percent of the elementary and secondary school population. There is little evidence that present programs of recruitment by higher education will meet the need -- in fact, there is cause for national alarm, particularly for the teachers in city schools in the 1990's.

It seems reasonable to hope that communities with high proportions of disadvantaged and minority students -- that is, these very cities -- will have a special interest in establishing programs within their schools to identify promising future teachers, to counsel with them, to provide financial support for their post-secondary education, and guarantee in advance their employment as teachers in their community. But community interest will have to be helped with incentives at state and federal level.

The national need is clearly established, and deserves a national program based on state planning and management. The basic source of supply of teachers and teachers-aides is within the schools, and the greatest need will be in Chapter 1 schools. The Committee may therefore wish to encourage Chapter 1 high schools by incentives and awards to select students with high qualifications and promise as future teachers and teacher-aides for elementary and secondary schools, and in the case of secondary schools with priority for teachers of science and mathematics; to counsel them, in cooperation with institutions of higher education to promote scholarship support, over above existing programs of financial aid, for post-secondary education in preparation for teaching, and to guarantee a teaching position in the city's own Chapter 1 schools if the post-secondary program is successfully completed.

A special appropriation might be authorized on a matching basis with states in the first year for state and district planning, and scholarships for college education in later years with special priorities for counseling and practice teaching throughout the program.

(4) The idea of using competition as a motive for improved performance has had a mixed record in public education. I can recall discussing the issue with the Congress a quarter century ago, favoring the conscious use of the competitive motive to encourage schools (not students) to do better. If the federal government was neither willing nor financially able to manage huge programs leading to better performance, then it might have to rely on encouraging competition to get motion in the desired direction. Yet while competition was accepted in economic life

and athletics it did not set well with educators. A variety of proposals since then, and especially the idea of providing vouchers to parents to encourage freer choice and competition, have caused much disagreement and constitutional concern. But recent developments in the states have emphasized both competition and accountability, and the climate of thought seems to me to have changed since the middle 1960s.

Two specific developments suggest the possibility of a federal incentive and award program. The first is the development of the sample system of assessing student performance (NAEP), and the collection of comparable data over more than a decade and a half. This is now widely accepted as dependable data on national performance, which it was not a quarter century ago, and Governor Alexander's recent report on NAEP is evidence to this point. And enough data has been assembled to show trend lines over time. This method of assessing results of schooling avoids the dangers of "teaching for the test", for the samples are very small. Yet it can clearly show weakness in student learning: see the data on high schools in my first suggestion.

The Chief State School Officers in 1986 voted to recommend that State data of the NAEP type be collected and made public -- a remarkable and landmark decision, which in my mind will lead in due course to the publication of data school by school on student learning as well as on drop out rates, finances, salaries and other important data. May I emphasize the words "in due course".

it will probably take quite a while. It took over a decade to achieve acceptance of the NAEP idea.

Yet, if the schools collect and publish such data, the basis of a fair, orderly and useful competition between schools of similar type and resources will be laid, which is not possible today.

My suggestion is that the Committee consult with the Governors and the Chief State School Officers on developing a program of incentives and awards to encourage schools of different types and serving different clienteles to work out the details of what these school reports should be. I would personally urge that these reports require both consultation and concurrence of the teachers in the particular schools. Since there are several years ahead before there is likelihood of "required" school reports, different solutions to the problem can be expected and encouraged. Trials can be held.

This does not seem likely to require either much money or long-term money. But incentive funds might help to prepare the way to a healthy competition in public education.

ATTACHMENT A

Background Statement for Second Change Academies

For many young people, dropping out of school is one more step in a downward spiral that sets them apart from successful peers. Drop outs have higher unemployment rates than graduates and when employed, are likely to earn less. They are also more apt to be dependent upon social support systems. And while these personal costs are great, so are society's projected economic costs. Based on research conducted in 1972, the nation loses approximately $77 billion annually in welfare and unemployment costs and in lost tax revenues.

But there is evidence that many drop outs regret their decision and, if given the opportunity, would return to complete their education and receive further employment training. For example, the number of GEDs awarded from 1967 to 1985 almost tripled -- and approximately one-third of these were earned by individuals 17-19 years old. And data from the High School and Beyond survey tells us that approximately 50% of high school sophomores who dropped out soon second guessed this decision.

The Committee may wish to consider incentives to encourage local educational agencies to establish "Second Change Academies" to provide academic, employment and social service opportunities for students, age 16-21, who have dropped out of school. These opportunities may include but not be limited to: intensive remediation in basic skills and development of higher order thinking skills; individualized learning programs that may make use of mastery-learning, computer-aided instruction, and experiential learning; opportunities for paid employment while attending the Academy; guaranteed full-time employment upon graduation; job banks and employment referral systems; employment and personal counseling; day care facilities and parenting information for participants with young children; housing and medical referral assistance; opportunities for developing mentor relationships with community and business representatives. Such Academies might operate year round during weekend and evening hours as well as during the business day and will offer options for GED or regular high school diplomas.

ATTACHMENT B

Programs for Teenaged Mothers

The magnitude and epidemic proportions of teenaged pregnancies and births have been well documented. Children continue to have children, joining the ranks of what some see as the most discriminated against group in our society in terms of educational and employment opportunities.

National statistics show that approximately 24% of all female drop outs leave school due to pregnancy, but other research indicates that this figure may be closed to 50%. They are also less apt to return to school and complete their education. Only 55% of 18 and 19 year old mothers in 1982 had completed high school. Teen mothers are more likely to be single parents mired in poverty and dependent upon welfare and other social services for their own and their children's survival. Children of teenaged parents share the excessive burdens of poverty. There is greater likelihood that cognitive development and later school performance will be deficient.

But some argue that maternal education and opportunity for academic and vocational advancement can have a positive impact on the lives of both teenaged parents and their offspring. To promote such opportunities, the Committee may wish the provide incentives to provide Chapter 1 schools with educational activities that will lead to the regular diploma or GED; employment training and employment opportunities; child rearing courses, and counseling services for teenaged parents, aged 16-19 who have not completed secondary school; to also provide day care and early childhood activities for their children during the time that parents partake of these services, activities and opportunities.

The **Chairman**. Dorothy Jones.

Mrs. **Jones**. Thank you, Senator. I'm very happy to be here today. I'm also glad I am the third speaker, there are a lot of things I don't have to say because they have been said. I would like to talk for a minute about one: the importance of the Federal Government giving the right kind of leadership. I agree, I am very happy they finally discovered Title One. (It will always be Title One to me, I'm sorry.)

The **Chairman**. I understand.

Mrs. **Jones**. I hope that the Congress and the administration will recognize that there is a role for the federal government to play in the partnership that must include all of us. Excellence in education has been determined to be a national priority, and it has got to be backed up; not with 2 million, because when you spread that out, it is not enough to do any good over enough of an area to make the kind of difference that must be made.

Children are only in school a certain numbers of years. We can't wait until we gradually increase the appropriations. I know there are priorities, but I think education is a lower priority now than it should be in terms not only of the social needs, but as I said in my written testimony, of national defense needs. We don't just need weaponry and strategy. We need human beings; and we need human beings who are educated and can exercise judgment; who have the skills that are necessary.

I won't go into a long story I told in the testimony about having been in the service in World War II and processed God knows how many discharges of able-bodied young men who simply couldn't learn enough to be good soldiers because they hadn't had the proper education.

We don't need the federal government to tell us in detail what to do. I think as previous speakers have said that we know enough about what to do; we need the supports, we need the research, we need the incentive programs, and they are not always just money. They cost money, but just money is not an effective incentive.

We need to enable people. We need to have sufficient flexibility. To be honest with you, I don't see that juggling Chapter Two money is going to help that much. When we had reconsolidation of funding, all of us lost a great deal that we had had in categorical funds, and in most places do a pretty good job in. I think we have to look at the importance of our nation as a whole; at good education in general.

Specifically on choice—which is a very important incentive—I hope that as people start talking about choice, we will use the term we use in Cambridge, which is "controlled choice." "Free choice" is what got school district after school district across this nation into court because people don't always choose what is best in the long run. Choice in Cambridge is controlled both for space availability and for racial balance, and it works. It works because we put in a lot of time and energy helping the community understand the educational importance of an integrated education; and because we have backed it up with a great deal of staff development, which is another incentive in our recruiting and maintaining a good staff.

We have a reputation for giving people an opportunity to do a lot of things that are important to individual teachers and that work well for students. I didn't see what time I started, so I don't know how much time I have left.

The **Chairman**. Keep going.

Mrs. **Jones**. I think it is very important to remember that most people in education want desperately to do a good job. In general, people lack the kind of support that develops self-respect; and people need to understand that what they are doing is perceived as important, and that when they need help, it's there. That's what we try to do in Cambridge with the limited resources we have. We utilize what we get from the state. (I think Massachusetts does more than any other state, as well, in terms of supporting education. New Jersey comes close but doesn't quite make it.)

There is need for incentives for more states to do more, but the federal government has to carry a share. So does the private sector. We have, in Cambridge, a partnership that is remarkable, with universities and businesses, banks and insurance companies and the school system, working with students and teachers and the administration; giving people a sense of pride in what they are doing, and tying the school system into the community where it belongs. That's all the time I have, so I'd better stop.

[The prepared statement of Mrs. Jones follows:]

HEARING BEFORE
.ENATE COMMITTEE ON LABOR & HUMAN RESOURCES
AND
SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, ARTS & HUMANITIES

October 5, 1987, East Boston High School

TESTIMONY OF DOROTHY S. JONES, CAMBRIDGE, MA

I am pleased to have this opportunity to share my thinking and that of others in Cambridge with you. First, I should like to tell you what we believe to be the incentives for the federal government to assume more of the responsibility for this and other educational initiatives than it has during the eighties.

Discounting the impact of sex and race discrimination (and, I must admit, it takes a good deal of imagination for a black woman to do so), education may be the single most important factor contributing to an individual's success. Without the proper education, it is difficult, if not impossible, to get and hold a job with any kind of future. Without that kind of job, it is very difficult to have a decent place to live, to provide for a family (including educating the children), to enjoy leisure activities.

Lack of a good education is a personal tragedy for the individual, but the problem is not merely an individual one; nor is it merely of local concern. It is a handicap to our nation. It is expensive to support the families of those without training who cannot do so themselves. It costs more to train such persons as adults than it would have cost to educate them as children. It costs even more to incarcerate those who, unable to earn an honest living, turn to crime. I have seen figures indicating it would be cheaper to send them to Harvard! Further, those who will be retiring in the next fifteen or twenty years should realize that it will, by then, take the contributions of three employed individuals to support each person's social security income. If we don't succeed in educating the children now in school, they won't be making those contributions then.

In addition, we should not forget that all our military strategies and sophisticated weaponry still depend on the people who back them up. I don't now what the figures would be if we were required to mobilize and augment our armed forces today, but I still recall vividly what I observed in 1944. A young WAC, trained in military administration, I was stationed at Fort Jackson, SC.; and for a few months processed and recorded hundreds upon hundreds of discharges "for the convenience of the government." The vast majority of these discharges were not for physical disability or disciplinary reasons. These were able-bodied men -- many of them eager volunteers -- who were labeled "inept" because, even after the army had spent as much time as it could afford in intensive literacy training, they were were functionally illiterate. They were unable to comprehend written orders, or identify signs such as "Danger: Mine Field," making them dangerous to themselves and their comrades in the field. Who knows what lost battles might have been won; what casualties might have been avoided; by how much the war might have been shortened if we had had the services of all the men who were simply too uneducated to serve? And that was in a simpler time, before automation, cybernation, advanced computers and nuclear technology.

Education is not just a social need, it is vital to our national defense. Municipalities and states must do their share, and so must the federal government, to help those of us who are trying to educate the nation's children. This administration has announced that excellence in education is a national priority. That is a first step; the next is commitment of sufficient resources.

We are fortunate in the Cambridge school system. Our city and state recognize and carry out their responsibility toward public education. The Commonwealth of Massachusetts has been a pioneer in requiring action and providing both fiscal and technical assistance to its school systems in the areas of school desegregation; the education of children whose first language is not English; the education of children with special needs; sex equity; and incentives, supports and rewards for school districts, parents and educators working toward school improvement.

The citizens of Cambridge have traditionally taken pride in their public schools and have been willing to support them. The Proposition 2 1/2 referendum, defeated in Cambridge but passed by the rest of the state, puts a cap on the amount that can be collected in local revenues, making it more difficult to increase the amount for schools from the general fund. Last year, the school system received $31,863,015 from local taxes and other local revenues, plus $19,923,140 in general state aid and $475,000 from federal revenue sharing funds. There is no longer any federal revenue sharing money, so we lose the equivalent of the salaries and fringe benefits for 15 experienced teachers.

In 1981, the Cambridge school system implemented the final phase of its desegregation plan, a unique controlled choice plan, now a national model, that eliminates local attendance zones, requires parents to indicate their choices of elementary schools and special programs, then assigns children based on parental preference, controlling for space and racial balance. All secondary students attend Cambridge Rindge & Latin School (CRLS), our one comprehensive high school. While our methodology may be unique, the concepts behind our efforts are at least a hundred and fifty years old. The very first public schools, established in the Massachusetts Bay Colony, were not very "public." They were not free, and black, Native American and poor white children rarely had the opportunity of attending them. Even though the schools evolved into a more democratic system, we still had official "colored schools" and "Irish schools" when Horace Mann left the state senate presidency to become executive to the first Massachusetts Board of Education.

Mann dreamed of the "common school" where children of all classes and elements of society would be educated together, so that:

> . . . the affinities of a common nature should unite them together so as to give the advantages of pre-occupancy and a stable possession to fraternal feelings, against the alienating competitions of later life.

Our goal, in Cambridge, is a modern version of Mann's vision. By all the usual measures of successful desegregation, of which I will cite only three, our plan is working. First, we were able to implement it without any violence or disruption of education. Second, despite our grandfathering all children in place except those whose schools were closed or merged in 1980-81, it took only three years to achieve our first goal: no racially identifiable schools. We are close to achieving the ultimate goal of having all schools, grades and special programs (except, of course, special needs and bilingual classes) reflect, within 5%, the overall minority/majority percentage system-wide. Third, our schools continue to be popular with all elements of the community. There are more non-public than public elementary schools in the city. The private and parochial schools enroll students from surrounding areas, as well as from Cambridge. In 1978, 78% of all elementary age children resident in the city were attending the public schools. After a very small white flight the first year of desegregation, that percentage has increased until it has stabilized in the last few years at between 87% and 88%.

The involvement of parents in choosing their child's school is only a beginning. Every elementary school has at least a twenty hour a week paid parent worker, most of them funded under our state desegregation grant and reporting to the citywide parent coordinator on the desegregation staff. Their tasks include helping parents with school choices by giving information about their school and conducting tours of it; publishing a regular newletter to all parents in the school; organizing an annual orientation for new parents; being available to parents who need assistance dealing with the school or the system, putting them in touch with the proper individual or department to handle a particular problem; and, above all, encouraging and expediting the participation of parents in the school's official parent organization as well as in a variety of special committees: School Improvement Council, interview committees for new staff, curriculum committees, etc. Many administrators, teachers, and parents have requested that the parent workers become full time. The high school has asked for parent workers. There is, certainly, enough work to keep them busy full time, but the answer is always the same -- we don't have the funds.

Cambridge offers Transitional Bilingual Education (TBE) programs for students whose first or dominant language is Spanish, Haitian creole, Mandarin & Cantones, Hindi & Gujarati, Korean and Vietnamese; as well as English as a Second Language (ESL) support services for students of limited English ability who are not accomodated in one of the TBE classes. A year ago, after more than a year of research and planning, we instituted an alternative Spanish/English two-way immersion program at the Maynard School (grades k-4). We recruited native Spanish speaking and a racially diverse group of native English speaking kindergarteners. The children were integrated in two classrooms, with two teachers, each of whom worked with each class for half a day. One teacher spoke only Spanish in the classroom, the other only English. At first, the students responded each in his/her native tongue, but they soon began to respond in whichever language the teacher was using.

That first group is now in first grade, with two new teachers following the same procedures; a new kindergarten group began last month. Comparisons with control groups in the system are encouraging. The Spanish-speaking children, while retaining and improving their Spanish, have made greater strides in English than a comparable group of children in a TBE kindergarten. The progress of the English-speaking group is on a par with that of students in English-only kindergartens. Their grasp of Spanish is developing somewhat more slowly than the Spanish students' grasp of English. This is understandable, since the external environment of the school and the community reinforces English, rather than Spanish. The evaluation, in essence, indicates that all the children are making progress, and that they are doing at least as well as, and sometimes better than they would had they not been in this new program. We plan, if the program continues to be as successful as we have reason to believe it will, to add a grade a year until it covers grades K through 6.

The two-way approach has a number of benefits. Research indicates that learning a second language early helps English speaking students, over time, do better in English, perhaps because they develop more awareness of language, per se. The approach helps the Spanish speaking student develop a more positive self-image. The message that child receives is not: "Forget your native language, it is useless, and learn ours." It is, instead: "Retain and improve your language, it has value that we respect, while you also learn to do well in ours." One need only to consult the personel department of any major corporation, or read the want ads in any major newspaper to realize the practical value, to everyone, of true bilingualism. Parents and school personnel have asked that we plan similar programs involving other languages. We would like to, if we only had the resources. For each grade level, we need two teachers who are fully bilingual as well as certified in Early Childhood or Elementary Education; one full time bilingual teacher aide; age appropriate texts and other materials in both languages.

We offer options in teaching/learning styles, ranging from the very traditional approach familiar to most of us grandparents to several types of open classroom programs. No two of our elementary schools are identical in philosophy, style, classroom climate, and the special programs available. Parents are urged to read the booklet that describes all the schools, and visit as many as possible before making choices.

Many schools have one or more special needs classes; most have resource rooms with specialist teachers to give support services to students whose needs can be met without their being in a self-contained classroom. Teachers of "regular" classes are encouraged to allow special needs and bilingual students to be mainstreamed for part of the day with their "regular" students by offering them a smaller class size. This allows for the extra attention these students need without either overworking the teacher or neglecting the other students. We have, at the Fitzgerald School, a program for pre-schoolers with special needs called "Special Start."

Our conputer "School of the Future," housed in the Tobin School (along with a standard program, a Follow Through program and an Open Magnet program) was not designed to teach computer technology, but rather to demonstrate the best uses of the computer as a tool in teaching all elementary curricula. The staff holds workshops for teachers from other schools, so we now have a cadre of teachers in every school who can help their colleagues integrate computers into their teaching. Thanks to resources provided by the Commonwealth, as well as the support of member corporations of the High Technology Council, we have some computers in every school, although not enough for every child to have the ideal amount of computer time, weekly, to help them prepare for the computer society of their future.

We need, also, find a way to put computers into the homes of families that can't afford to buy them. Most Cambridge families of sufficient means tend already to have computers at home. Perhaps we could establish some sort of lending library of hardware and software, that would be an incentive, not only for students to learn more about this valuable tool, but for also many of their parents. We would need not only the funds to purchase the equipment, but also to maintain it.

For reasons of space, I will describe only one more of our special programs. The Robert F. Kennedy School in East Cambridge serves students in grades 5 through 8 (it is paired with the Maynard School where the AMIGOS program is located). It has had many problems: absenteeism: some older students staying at home to take care of younger ones while parents were at work, some simply truanting; lack of parent involvement: many parents do not speak a great deal of English; many work long hours at low-paid factory jobs and lack the energy; they come from cultures in which they did not, traditionally, visit the school unless notified that their children were in trouble; low achievement scores, with many parents unable to help their children at home.

Several faculty members, working with the Coordinator of Dramatic Arts, wrote a proposal that was funded by the Massachusetts Council on Arts & Humanities, through the Cambridge Multicultural Arts Center, located a short distance from the school. The matching share was provided from our state desegregation grant and our federal Chapter II allocation.

Starting in only a few classrooms, "Teaching and Learning Through the Arts" now, in its third year, encompasses almost the entire school. Experts in all fields of the graphic and performing arts are brought into the school to work with teachers and students, infusing their arts into all phases of the curriculum. Students, individually and in groups work on projects. Examples: a unit on Egypt resulted in colorful student-made life-size models of Egyptians. Another group constructed models of urban neighborhoods, their own or imaginary. The projects use paper, clay, cardboard and other simple materials. Student work is displayed in the lobby of the building where everyone can see it, and also at the Multicultural Arts Center. Plays and musicals are performed in the school auditorium and at the Center.

This program is making a difference. It has sparked teachers, students and their parents. Some students now come to school regularly in order to keep up with their projects. Parents have begun to help, both at home and at school, with construction, costumes, etc. Teachers are stimulated as they learn from the artists. Parents, teachers and students from othr schools have seen some of the exhibits, and want to try the program themselves. If we had the resources, we could replicate it.

Our largest elementary school, the Harrington, serves a K-8 population similar to that of the Kennedy. That staff, having, through inservice training, developed a high degree of success in teaching language arts, has for the last couple of years been seeking, unsuccessfully, a source of funds to enable it to develop a program in the languages of mathematics, science and technology.

All the above programs are essentially student oriented, but they serve to assist and stimulate teachers, also. Similarly the three categories of programs we offer staff, by helping them work effectively, are of benefit to students. It is difficult to separate the impact.

We are able, first of all, to attract and maintain a good staff because our salaries are competitive, with attractive working conditions, fringe benefits, preparation time, etc. Most teachers, however, are not in the field just for these items, as important at they are to survival.

Some programs are system-oriented, based on the system's goals as enunciated in our Key Results process of goal-setting, action, evaluation, revision goals. A strong and well-managed Affirmative Action policy assures the stimulus of diversity within the staff as well as providing role models for many students who have never seen people with whom they can identify in positions of authority. System-wide workshops on multiculturalism, paid for out of the general fund and state desegration money, help us capilize on the diversity of staff and students. Multiculturalism is not some esoteric new subject, but an approach to teaching all curricula in a way that recognizes the contributions of all ethnic groups to our society; and that reflects in the materials selected for teaching, in the displays in the classroom, and in the attitudes of the teacher, the respect due to all elements in the society, especially as they are represented among the students.

We have ten system-wide Staff Development Teachers, eight paid out of the desegregation grant: some special programs have their own staff developers. These are classroom teachers selected because of their expertise and their ability to communicate with their peers. Four days a week they are in schools: the orient new teachers; assist selected teachers in each school, individually and in groups, with classroom management, multiculturalism, and teaching techniques. They work with the relevant curriculum coordinators, revising curriculum; they research new approaches to teaching and improved teaching materials. The results of these activities are then reflected in their work with classroom teachers. The staff development program is popular with teachers and administrators; it should be expanded to allow every access to these supports.

Administrators and/or teacher teams have been able to participate in general-funded workshops on integrating the curriculum; Deming's management concepts; the Degrees of Reading Power program; dealing with Substance Abuse with elementary students; etc.

The state's Chapter 188 School Improvement Act provides for School Improvement Council that allows the administration, teachers and parents of a school to do joint planning on how to spend a per capita sum to which each school is entitled and that must be used for improvement in some fashion. The state-funded Comonwealth Inservice grants offer teachers up to $1000 to conduct activities they feel are important for their classes.

Other incentives are designed to meet the needs of individual teachers and administrators. When we realized that the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act would net us considerably less support than we had previously received at catagorical grants, we established the Cambridge Demonstration Center. CADENCE surveys the interests and needs of individual staffers; offers workshops and mini-courses to meet those needs. Staff is also given the opportunity to teach any of these courses. CADENCE programs are shared with other school systems, at cost, and also with the non-public schools, as the law provides.

Lesley College offers scholarships for graduate study to our staff; the Harvard Graduate School of Education offers programs for school administrator through its Principals' Center, and Conant Fellowships that allow staff to take courses at teach at HGSE. Cambridge has three Conant Fellows this year.

We have had a great deal of success in Cambridge, of which we are duly proud. (See enclosed Memorandum for a listing of recognition given our programs and staff thus far in 1987.) Yet, we know there is still much to be done before we can say we have done it all.

Twenty-two percent of our elementary students did not pass basic skills achievement tests in the last round. We need to identify those students and their areas of weakness, so plans for improvement can be devised. Nearly one-third of our most recent graduating class did not go on to further education. Are they truly prepared for jobs with a future, or will we find them behind the counter of our local fast food emporium? We don't know, and we need to find out. Once we know the facts, we have to act to meed the needs of those students still with us.

The Cambridge Teachers' Association recently surveyed teachers and administrators about job satisfaction. Analysis of the results and a response by the Superintendent indicate that, while we are doing a better than average job, a number of new initiatives involving teachers, administrators and parents would be desirable.

The Black Faculty recently released a thoughtful and inciteful analysis of the problems faced by minority students at the secondary level. We need to improve guidance; develop methods of interesting students in becoming really involved in their own education and in the life of the school; find ways -- at the elementary as well as the secondary level -- to encourage all students, and especially minorities, to select more demanding elective courses and programs that will lead to better career options for them.

We need to conduct the research that will lead to some solutions for a serious problem in bilingual education. We have a number of older non-English-speaking students -- upper elementary and secondary age -- who come to us with little or no schooling in their native languages. They are usually from poor families; come from areas where schools were expensive, or where there was none close enough to them. We cannot put a 14-year-old in with seven-year-olds, at whose academic level we find him, and expect him to prosper. At the same time, he will only be discouraged if we put him with his age-mates, most of whom are at or near grade level in their native tongue, and only need to learn English to enter our mainstream. The result is that most such students leave us as soon as they turn 16, illiterate in two languages, and completely unequipped for survival in our society. In addition to the research for methods, we need to find or create effective bilingual learning materials for these older students.

We need the resources to replicate our successful programs in other schools that want them. We need more and more effective counselling for the upper elementary student, to minimize some secondary problems. We want to do all these things. We want to realize our goal of providing an equal opportunity for a high-quality integrated education for every child entrusted to us.

I will close with some comments about incentives, in general. Incentives should reward growth and progress, not just excellence. They should apply to students, parents, teachers, administrators, schools and school systems. While we certainly shouldn't ignore the achievement of the straight A student, we need, especially, to reward the one who works hard and brings a D average up to a C.

Schools and school systems should be rewarded when they move from poor to good, from good to better, from better to superior. Giving support only to the poorest schools penalizes those who do a pretty good job but want to do even better; rewarding only excellent schools doesn't help the poorer ones improve, and may act to discourage them from even trying.

Sanctions, whether against individuals, schools or school systems, should be a last resort, to be used only when there is an absolute refusal or a clear indication of inability to improve. For example: Cambridge rarely has to dismiss a teacher for poor performance. When it does happen, it is only after a series of events has taken place and nothing has worked. First, there is an in-depth evaluation of performance, identifying the abilities and interests of the teacher. In any case, dismissal is considered only after these steps are taken and a sufficient amount of time has been allowed for improvement. We find that most people in education want to do a good job. Many need a support system that provides both the incentives and the resources that make success possible.

At the state level: our state needs more resources to enable it to help more schools and school systems; other states need the same, plus the incentives to devote the energy and resources to education that Massachusetts does.

At the federal level: the federal government can play a significant leadership role in providing more of the kind of research and program dissemination that will be useful to states and localities; and in providing more, rather than less, resources to helps us achieve its own goal of excellence.

#####

ENCLOSURES

WITH TESTIMONY OF DOROTHY S. JONES, CAMBRIDGE

CAMBRIDDGE SCHOOLS AT A GLANCE

Memorandum on Achievements in 1987

Chamber of Commerce Article on Partnership

Sample Parent Newsletters

(Note: Due to printing limitations, and in the interest of economy, the above enclosures accompanying Mrs. Jones' statement were retained in the files of the committee.)

Mr. **Fliegel**. Good morning, I would like to thank the committee for the opportunity to describe what is happening in District 4 in Manhattan. We are located in East Harlem in New York City. We have all the problems that are endemic to an inner city school district. I come to tell you that inner city school districts can provide quality education for its youngsters.

In 1973 District 4 ranked 32nd out of 32 school districts in reading and mathematics. In 1987 it ranked 16th. In 1973 15.9 percent of the youngsters were reading on grade level. This year we have over 64 percent of our youngsters reading at grade level. The same is true in mathematics.

In New York City we have a decentralized system. Pre-kindergarten to the 9th grade goes to a decentralized district. The high schools are centralized. We do not do a good job for our high school youngsters in New York City. We do have a number of specialized high schools that are schools of excellence. Unfortunately, we have some of the best high schools in the country and too many of the worst high schools.

In 1973 approximately ten youngsters in the entire district were accepted into these specialized high schools. Last year over 250 youngsters were accepted into specialized and private schools.

In 1983 I had the opportunity to appear before this committee. Going over my testimony, I notice that at that time I spoke about the Manhattan Center for Science and Mathematics. It was one year old, and I rather immodestly stated that we are succeeding. I would like to just point out, give you a report card of, what is happening at that high school.

In 1986, we graduated our first graduating class. Benjamin Franklin was once a good school, and one of its great graduates is Senator Patrick Moynihan. But from 1973 to 1982, it was a failing school. I still can't believe the statistics that I quote to you.

Seven percent of the youngsters who entered that school as freshman graduated. That meant 93 percent of youngsters dropped out. If you would take attendance in the morning—no one had the courage to take it in the afternoon—44 percent of the youngsters were showing up.

We opened the Manhattan Center in 1982, in 1986 we graduated our first class. Every youngster in that class graduated, and every youngster was accepted into college and is now presently in college. I cite this because I think it is a symbol of what the district believes in and what can happen in education in the United States.

I'd like to talk a little bit about choice because choice is very much the topic of discussion. First of all, I want to make it clear, when I talk about choice, I talk about choice for public education. In my view, youngsters in private education already have choice, so we don't have to talk about private schools. I do have a standing rule that goes something like this: What's good for the children of the wealthy will never harm the children of the poor. And I think choice is one of these things children of public education should have.

I do have some thoughts about it that I would like to share with you. First of all, I think it is important that prior to choice, you have to have some quality and some diversity. It will do no one any good that they can now choose to go from one lousy school to another and in the process have to travel a half hour to get there.

I also believe that smaller schools are just better for youngsters. Kids don't get lost in small schools. I believe it is important to extend ownership to youngsters, to parents and to professionals. And even more importantly, I believe that a school has to believe in something. There has to be a dream, there has to be a vision, a philosophy that the school believes in.

In Alice in Wonderland, Alice is lost and she is walking through the woods, and she comes upon the wise owl, and she says, which way should I go? He asks her, where do you want to get to? She says, I don't know. And he says, it doesn't matter which way you go. I think that's true of many schools we have throughout the country where there is an absence of a vision, an absence of a belief system.

I see time is short, I would just like to give you an idea of what I think the government should do. I think it is very important that the federal government provide adequate funding to the children of the poor. I think it is most important that we begin to take a look at where the money does go, and somewhere there has to be incentives to those districts, to those schools that are doing a good job for the youngsters of the poor. Somehow that money does not go that way. That we keep sending money into failure is something that we ought to question, and we ought to support that which works. Thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Fliegel follows:]

Testimony of Sy Fliegel, Deputy Superintendent, Community School District 4, Manhattan, New York City, Formerly Director of Alternative Education

Good Morning! I would like to thank the committee for providing an opportunity to present some of my views and biases regarding education and to describe the educational program in District 4, Manhattan.

District 4 is located in East Harlem-in New York City. It has all the problems associated with inner city school districts. I come to let you know that inner city school districts can provide quality education for their youngsters.

In 1973, District 4, Manhattan ranked 32nd out of 32 districts in reading achievement (15.9% at or above grade level as measured on city-wide standardized tests):

In 1987, the district ranked 16th of 32 with 64.% at or above grade level. In Mathematics in 1973 we also ranked 32nd out of 32 districts. This year we ranked 21st.

In New York City - we have a decentralized school system for grades Pre-K to the 9th grade. The high schools are centralized. We do not do a good job for our high school students. Depending on whose figures you use, the dropout rate ranges from 36% to 45% and the rate for minority youngsters is much higher.

In New York City - the outstanding high schools are the specialized high schools with national reputations as schools of excellence- (The Bronx H.S. of Science, Stuyvesant H.S., Brooklyn Tech, F. La Guardia.)

In 1973 approximately 10 students from District 4 were accepted into the specialized high schools. Last year over 250 of our students were accepted into the specialized high schools or private schools.

On September 22, 1983, I had the pleasure of appearing before this committee; at that time, I explained in some detail how our alternative school network operated and in that testimony, I mentioned that we had opened up our first high school, The Manhattan Center for Science and Mathematics. At that time it was only 1 year old-and I rather immodestly stated, "I can assure you after only 1 year that we are succeeding ."

I'd like to go into some detail about our Manhattan Center because I feel it can be representative or symbolic of what we, in District 4, believe is possible and attainable.

We had demonstrated that elementary and junior high school students in an inner city district could achieve and compete. Unfortunately, the quality of high school programs offered in New York City is limited. We have some of the best high schools in the country and too many of the worst. We were graduating fine youngsters from junior high school and we had little to say about which high schools they would attend and even less to say about the educational program they would receive. In our community, the zoned high school was Benjamin Franklin High School. Many years ago when it opened, it was a good high school.

One of its most outstanding graduates is Senator Patrick Moynihan. Unfortunately from 1973 to 1983, it was a failing school.

I have cited the following statistics 1,000 times and I still can't fully comprehend their meaning.

Only 7% of Benjamin Franklin entering freshman class graduated; that left 93% as dropouts. Attendance in the morning was 44%. District 4 did not send any of our students to Benjamin Franklin; the Central Board finally decided to phase out the school. It was closed in June, 1982 and we in partnership with the Central Board of Education reopened it in September, 1982 as the Manhattan Center for Science and Mathematics. It is an educational complex that contains a separate elementary, junior high school and senior high school. Each school within the Center provides an enriched curriculum in math and the sciences with computer literacy being a major subject. Our goal was to prepare youngsters for a technological society and get them to go to college. In 1983, I could only say what we hoped would happen. Today, I am pleased to tell you that we graduated our first class in June 1986; all the students graduated and were accepted into college. Some of the colleges being among the best in the country. I have enclosed articles from the New York Times and Newsday for your perusal.

On September 21st of this year, the Honorable Minister of Education, Mr. Baker of Great Britain, visited District 4, Manhattan.

He was particularly interested in our parental choice - or free choice system. Secretary of Education, William Bennett has cited the district favorably on numerous occasions. I would like to state some basic assumptions that I hold in regard to our choice system:

1. I am talking about public schools and public education and their responsibility to provide quality education. Without quality or diversity-choice becomes meaningless.

2. I also believe that smaller schools are better for children. Kids don't get lost in small schools. We would rather have many small schools, integrating age levels than large junior high schools. We have many of our junior high schools in elementary schools buildings. We feel the interaction is good for youngsters.

3. I believe that extending ownership of the schools for students, parents and teachers enhances achievement and develops good citizens. People treat what they own better than what they don't own.

4. I believe that a school has to have a vision-a dream-a philosophy. We have to know where we want to go-and how to get there. In Alice In Wonderland - Alice is walking through the woods-lost. She comes upon the wise owl and asks him,

"which way should I go?" He answers, "where do you want to go?" She replies, "I don't know,"- he tells her,- "Then it doesn't matter which way you go."

In District 4, we have extended ownership of the schools to professionals, parents and students. To the professionals we say, we want you involved in the decision-making process. What is your vision, your dream or educational philosophy? How do you propose to achieve your dreams and goals? We are not committed to any one philosophy of education. We have schools that range from traditional to. progressive. Everyone has a clear understanding about what the school's goals and processes will be; they then attempt to work hard to make the dream a reality.

To the parents and students we offer real choices. On the junior high level there is no zoned school. Every youngster and parent on that level must make a choice. We feel that by exercising choice the students' interest and motivation for learning is significantly increased. Competition is healthy for schools. In District 4, each junior high school enters the market place. We view students as potential clients and not as members of a captive constituency. If schools cannot attract and keep students, those schools must change. Expectations for students and staff are high. We expect our youngsters to achieve and develop into responsible citizens.

In closing, I would like to comment on the role that the Federal Government must play if education is to become a real priority in this country.

The Federal Government must provide adequate funding and support for the children of the poor. It should support those programs that have demonstrated success with inner city children. We need money to provide meaningful experiences for children such as trips, camping experiences and attendance at cultural events.

We need money for after-school programs and summer school.

We need money for science materials, textbooks and high technology equipment.

We need money to prevent 45% of our high school students from dropping out.

The job can be done-we have demonstrated that in District 4-

We do need your help-

Enclosures: Alternative School Booklet
Decisions Booklet
Press Clippings
Previous Senate Testimony

(Note: Due to printing limitations, and in the interest of economy, the above-mentioned enclosures were retained in the files of the committee.)

The CHAIRMAN. Well, we apologize to all of you for the shortage of time. We have been joined by some other classes. I will just say very briefly that our hearing this morning is about incentives that have been effective in strengthening the quality of education in many of the school districts or some of the school districts in our country, and we will hear from some of those individuals that are involved in working out those incentives and see about their application at a national level. So, we have been listening to some of those who have been working and who have been involved in programs which are successful.

Let me start out with Mr. Mills, Dr. Mills. In this program that you have developed here, this leadership consortium, could you spell out somewhat for us what you see as the role at the local level, and what are the state and national roles in the consortium.

Dr. MILLS. The whole thing from first to last has to be a partnership. There has been a vast federal investment in studies of instructional technologies, information on programs that work, and so on. That tends to be disbursed around the country. You either see the pamphlet or you don't. It is not used as part of a professional curriculum. I would focus that professional curriculum. That would be part of the Federal role.

Determining the kind of training that ought to be offered in a particular school seeking one of these performance grants ought to be at least a joint local and state venture. There ought to be a kind of an audit of what's necessary.

There is no way for one state to put this together by itself. Many states have tried. There is no way for the federal government to do it alone either. And certainly no one who has ever sat through a so-called in-service day in a local school would believe that a local school knows how to do the training that has to be done. Why don't we concentrate our energy and our ideas and simply deliver the knowledge that is effective in a timely way in the hands of people in local schools who can use it? That's what this argument is about.

The CHAIRMAN. You are not too concerned that there would be too much weight at the federal and national level or do you believe that the program can be established with sufficient flexibility to allow state and local, educators to do what they really want to do. Or would it be too straight-jacketed in such ways so that maybe it works well in New Jersey, but it doesn't work well in New Hampshire.

Dr. MILLS. That's why I think it would be useful to try it in two or three states. I would bind those states together rather loosely. There has to be an element of flexibility; you don't want to be delivering training that is not needed. It has to be timely; there is no point in talking to local school people about a new program if they're at the wrong stage in their budget cycle. Flexibility has to be built in all the way through it.

The CHAIRMAN. One of the programs that New Jersey has accepted are these cash awards to outstanding teachers. Can you tell us a little bit about that and how many have you given, how does it work?

Dr. MILLS. Yes. There have been 2,800 of those cash awards. Each one is worth a thousand dollars. The recipients, the teachers who receive these awards for outstanding teaching, are selected locally by panels that include board members, teachers, the union and so on.

As Governor Kean has said, a thousand dollars isn't a lot of money, but it brings with it a very big message. The message is that the people of New Jersey think that teachers often know what's best and can make very sensible decisions about how to spend a thousand dollars on the curriculum. Incidentally, this money does not go into their pockets. They direct the spending of it on instruction in the local school.

The Chairman. And that has been acceptable by the taxpayers?

Dr. Mills. Yes, it has. These are day-long convocations on education. It is quite an impressive sight to see over a thousand teachers sitting there talking about improving education.

The Chairman. Well, I think you have probably seen what others have seen, and that is, where the taxpayer is convinced that taxes are going to strengthen the quality of education, they are willing to pay for that, and I imagine this kind of experience has helped build a greater kind of confidence, too, in terms of support for education. Let me go to Doctor Keppel. If there is a point that we raise on one question and others want to speak on it, I would be glad to hear anyone out.

Dr. Keppel, if you remember, described a performance-based center scheme which was tried many years ago. Those were said to have failed. Why do you believe today that those types of incentives schemes would be successful?

Mr. Keppel. I guess, Senator, because I'm not sure how you use the word incentive. There was made a direct connection of a couple of things, experiments, you may recall, which didn't settle into the community at all. The real problem is——

The Chairman. Just hold on. We have a new group of classes coming in. The subject of this hearing is incentives to try and improve the quality of education in our high schools, and we are listening to a panel who comes from different parts of the country who are involved in those programs. We are now questioning the panel.

From this hearing, we are going to consider whether some of these recommendations would be appropriate for the Federal Elementary-Secondary Education Act, which is the principal Federal legislation that supports the local and State education process. That's where we are. Excuse me, Doctor Keppel.

We are talking now about incentive grants. We have seen incentive schemes that have been said to have failed in the past, and we are now wondering, since there have been a number of recommendations in support of incentive grants, why there is a feeling that they might work in today's education.

Mr. Keppel. My particular use of the word incentive is in connection with data of students' performance at a level of performance in schools is not based in any way on the notion that as a result of better performance, the schools get more money. At this stage I'm making a much narrower point. If over the next five years, and I don't think it would take that long, one can develop methods of reporting on performance of schools in learning, we can then get a way of comparing schools which have more or less comparable inputs, sources, books, money, and a way, a fair way for parents and students themselves to decide which way to go.

I do not think we have any such comparable techniques now. My suggestion specifically for incentives in this regard is to start now with the Federal Government putting up some of the money to develop those reporting systems. That's what I meant by trying to get that in. Let things we call a fair, flat field.

The **Chairman**. We included in the legislation, at a subcommittee level last week, a 400 million dollar authorization for basic skills at the high school level. We are all very concerned about the drop-out rate. How do you think incentives can be used to keep kids in the school?

Mr. **Keppel**. In the testimony that I put in, I make a suggestion or two with regard. First, which I think is the most difficult problem, and I imagine it is safe to assume, is young men and women who have already dropped out, how we get them back in. We think maybe some quite new kinds of schools, incentives would be possible.

The use of the GED, that other method of getting a high school diploma, which has grown a lot in the last 10 years. Those, in my judgment at least, are the ways to try to start at the drop.

Mrs. **Jones**. And start before the drop out, too.

The **Chairman**. Maybe you can talk a little bit about what has happened in Cambridge with the formulation you have outlined in your oral testimony, and about how that is effective with drop outs; and what lessons can be learned from that.

Mrs. **Jones**. We apply, to the extent that we can, incentives that are, again, not cash incentives that you can put in your pocket, but the State Chapter 188 School Improvement Act provides an award that gives a teacher who has done some outstanding things in a program in a particular school the opportunity to take her this program to other parts of the State to disseminate it. This provides recognition for the person, and encouragement for other teachers to go ahead and do likewise.

We haven't done nearly enough, but we are working to try to reconnect students to the school, and it is difficult. In our city we have a single comprehensive high school which is large. We have a house system, but people still get lost in the cracks.

We have improved the quality of teaching by a great deal of inservice training of various kinds using Federal, State and local moneys. Every penny we can get goes into some kind of improvement in that area. And again, we involve teachers not only in taking in-service training courses, but teachers who prove competent are given an opportunity to teach them.

Teachers are given an opportunity to initiate ideas. Students can come up with suggestions. We work with students, but not nearly enough: our goal is have students involved in helping to solve the problems that affect the lives of students. It is going to take a while, and it is going to take some resources we don't now have, because we need to develop a mentor system to go with it. The advising system we now have is not really good enough to accomplish the goals.

We want to involve high school students in the outside community, both through the partnership with private industry and the universities and through tying students into community service for credit, so that their work in school becomes meaningful to the individuals and, hopefully, they won't get to the point of dropping out.

We still have problems, and I'm sure most schools who get such students do, with the older, non-English speaking student who comes to us from areas where they have not had the kind of education other kids have had. For example: a 14-year-old who is functioning at the same level as some of our seven or eight year olds.

Now you can't put that student in a class with seven- or eight-year-olds. Put him in a class with his age-mates and he is not going to make it. He is going to drop out at age 16 illiterate in two languages. We haven't found the answers. That's one of the problems we need to be helped with because quite a few older students from Central America, Haiti, and Southeast Asia.

These youngsters are coming to us with essentially no education, maybe two or three years in their native tongue, for one reason or another: war, poverty, lack of schools to attend. So, it is not just a matter of transferring to English, it is a matter of where do you start and how do you hold them while you are trying to help them. As it is now, they are not prepared to function in society at all, even if they go back home.

The CHAIRMAN. One of the things that we are proposing is this illiteracy course in higher education, to get students in liberal arts to work in local communities to combat illiteracy, with the academic institutions giving course credit. We have seen, on a limited basis, that this has had an important impact on the increasing number of functional literates (about 1,600,000 a year). These numbers are going in the wrong direction and it is of great concern for our overall economy, let alone for individual development, individual pride, and self-esteem.

We have about a 50 million dollar authorization for drop-out programs in the trade bill which is in conference at the present time. It is independent of the Elementary and Secondary Education bill. Whether that is going to go through and be signed into law is still somewhat in question. My own belief is it is looking more and more like it probably will. I think that there is a recognition at the national level of the importance of working in innovative programs in the drop out area.

I was hoping you might take a moment and describe the AMIGOS program. We were getting closer to it as you were talking about newer families coming into the community, and we will be getting into the reauthorization of bilingual education in the next very few weeks, and that program has been under a lot of review by both our Committee and others.

We are familiar with the studies you have had here in Massachusetts, and I'm sure you are familiar with the debates that have been taking place on that program——

Mrs. JONES. I am for bilingual education because I grew up in a time when there wasn't any, and I saw people coming from Europe and other continents, many countries, and some of them made it, and some of them didn't. But I remember people sitting in classes with me years and years ago (my children would say back in the Middle Ages); the teacher couldn't understand a word they said; they couldn't understand a word the teacher said, and they sat there, and only some of them were lucky enough to have the ability pick up enough English to survive.

Others put in their time and just faded into the woodwork. Now I think we have the beginning of something that takes care of most kids, but we are always looking for new approaches that are better. The transitional bilingual program, which is standard here in Massachusetts at least, takes a youngster in, for one to maybe four years. They start out 75 percent native language instruction, 25 percent English as the second language; as they learn English, it goes to 50/50 and then 75 percent English and 25 percent their language until they are mainstreamed.

That's the way they had been doing it in Cambridge, but that has some disadvantages for many youngsters. The program tends to give to some kids the impression that "Your language isn't any good; you have got to forget it and just learn English". We have been looking for ways of providing some new kind of approach, some kind of education in a different way for non-English speaking kids who could then maintain their own pride and self-worth.

The AMIGOS program is our beginning. It is in its second year; we now have a kindergarten and a first grade. We started last year with a kindergarten group. We recruited an equal number of native English speaking and native Spanish speaking youngsters. The native English speaking youngsters were also racially integrated. There was not a Spanish class and an English class; they were put together in two classrooms, both classrooms integrated.

There are two teachers for each grades, each of them teaches each group half a day. The English speaking teacher speaks only English to the group and the Spanish speaking teacher speaks only Spanish to the group. In the beginning, the kids responded in their own language—the school teachers happen to be bilingual anyway—but as time went by, increasingly they began to respond in whichever language they were addressed.

We have been testing these kids, and we had all kinds of control groups. We found that the Spanish kids in this class at the end of kindergarten were way ahead in English of kids in the standard Transitional Bilingual program, and that the English speaking kids were on par with kids in an English-only class.

We recognize that it takes a little longer for the Spanish language to be developed because the whole environment surrounding these kids reinforces English more than it would be the Spanish for English speaking kids.

We also did something else to help reinforce them. We offered the parents the opportunity to take courses: the Spanish speaking parents to take English, and the English speaking parents to take Spanish. We provide those courses, and a lot of parents take advantage of it so they can help their kids at home. This is also a multicultural approach. They learn of the various Hispanic cultures as well as the standard American.

We find that it is a popular program. It's an exciting program, I believe, which we invite you to come visit any time, anybody. They love visitors, love to show off. I'll give you one little vignette, and then I'll stop.

About three weeks into the program, I guess it was about this time last year, in first kindergarten, a little English speaking girl wanted a toy, and the Spanish speaking boy who had no English at all yet had the toy. When he realized she wanted it, he clutched it and shook his head. She looked at him and said, "por favor" (Spanish remark un-interpreted), "please" and she got it!

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Fliegel, let me ask you about the transferability of the programs you have seen in New York. Can these programs be used in other school districts in the country; if you think so, why; and if not, why not?

Mr. FLIEGEL. I'll tell you what I think can be transferred to any school. In Shaw's Pigmalion, the question is asked about the difference between a flower girl and a lady. I think the response is, it is not how she behaves, but how she is treated. And I think one of things you will find in almost every successful school environment is that youngsters are treated with respect. This is not the way they behave, but how they are treated, treat them with respect, with high expectations, and they will not disappoint you.

On the other hand, if you don't, treat them with respect and high expectations they won't disappoint you again. If your expectation is they will not be good citizens, they will not behave, they will not disappoint you. I think it is an important feature, and I'm glad Ms. Jones was really centering in on youngsters, how do we treat young people in schools.

I think it is an important aspect, and that's why I think ownership is important. You just treat things you own better than things you don't own, and once you begin to open up these ideas to youngsters that that school belongs to them, that they made a decision, just that process of making that decision, I want to be here, gives you a three week advantage. If the school isn't any good, you have lost it, but I think it is important.

I do think you can transfer what we are doing. There is nothing new about what we are doing. It is just a different way of looking at youngsters. It is trying to meet their interests. How come kids know lyrics? I don't know the lyrics of one song, and kids know lyrics that go on and on and on, and someone says, maybe they can't be bothered to learn the words of a poem, because their interest isn't in the poem. Somewhere a long the line we have to make that match. You have to know what a youngster's interests are, and that's what I think we do when we offer choice, and that's why I think diversity is important.

If we offer the same thing, just choosing the same thing in different places, I think we are going to make a critical mistake. I think it is most important that we keep that in mind.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me ask you, what has been the effect on the teachers? You talk about the students. What has been the impact on the——

Mr. FLIEGEL. It is a funny thing about teachers, Senator, they are just like all the other people. You treat them with respect, you give them impact on decision making and they respond positively. One thing nice about giving away ownership of schools, you can give away 400 percent. There is no limit as to how often you can just give the school away to people.

Teachers, when given ownership, will be most supportive. You know what it is, it is almost a self-fulfilling prophecy. If you ask teachers to dream, to give you their visions, then you say, go ahead and do it, they are going to kill themselves to prove that's the way you educate youngsters. I want to make a point. In our district we run the gamut. We have some very progressive schools, and we have some schools that you would almost call a prep school.

They both work because people believe in something. They know where they are trying to go, and they have a voice with what's happening. So teachers are very supportive of that kind of system because they feel they are part of it. They are not just assigned to a school.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me ask a question in a different area, and that is about the training of minority teachers. What should we be thinking about on that issue? I'll ask Dr. Keppel and any of those that want to answer.

Mr. KEPPEL. I think my colleagues, particularly Dorothy, would probably know more about it than I do. All the data that I see says that the numbers of young men and women, some of them seated here, as far as whether they are going to turn out to be teachers or not, it looks as if the percentages are going down in minority schools. It looks, in other words, the percentage of those going to college and the like who would end up teaching school is not a very promising figure.

New Jersey and other states I think have been doing very helpful things about looking up different avenues, but I think they face a long term, decade, two decade long process. We will need more young men and women who will be willing and active to teach in the minority schools, particularly in the city. My conclusion is if we think in the long term, we should start recruiting among those who are now in high school, in the cities in particular, and start recruiting and providing special help financially, Pell Grants through college.

I happen to believe even more in work studies where practice teaching would be paid for as they go through. I think we ought to start now, sir. It is the down the road that bothers me. Not two years from now, not five years from now, but ten, 15 years.

Mrs. JONES. I think we need to start a little earlier. I think we need to start in the middle years. I think we are a little late if we wait to high school, because kids not on the right tracks, their minds are made up. I think there are a number of reasons why we are getting fewer minorities going into teaching. One, of course, is a good reason—there are more options now.

There was a time when all we would do was teach or preach. Now, we offer more options so the kids are doing other things; but there is also something else, there is a perception among a lot of people that teaching is not a respected profession any more, and that when there is desegregation, the minority teacher gets shipped out the door. Those two factors have to be dealt with in any program, because unfortunately neither perception is completely unrealistic. It does happen; not everywhere, but it does happen.

The CHAIRMAN. This has been very helpful. We will move on. What I would like to do as we begin to evaluate these recommendations, as I'm sure the other members of our Committee will do as well—is to circulate this information to the members of the panels before we get a final vote on them. This has been personally very informative.

I think these have been enormously exciting developments, and you all deserve a lot of credit, for the innovativeness that we have been involved in. Again, we are interested in seeing how these ideas can be translated in a broader kind of experience, and we are going to need your help to do it effectively. I want to thank all of you very much.

We are going to proceed out of order for just a few moments. I understand Senator Richard Kraus who is Chairman of the Massachusetts Senate Committee on Education, and Representative Nicholas Paleologos, who is Chairman of Massachusetts House Committee on Education, have joined us. They sit on a special commission created by Chapter 188, education reform legislation passed in 1985, and have just completed two very important reports which consider the use of incentives in education here in the Commonwealth. We are pleased that they took time out to come here this morning and offer their reports into the record, and I know they will be helpful as we consider the issues, and I ask you to proceed in whichever way you like. We are very grateful to you. I think one of the things that we are finding out is there is a lot going on at the local and state levels which we can profit from. These are programs like our JEDI program, ET program here, and the use of satellite technology to try and strengthen our education system. And there is a lot going on at the state level, and we are eager to hear what you would tell us about the report in a limited period of time. You can be assured that we will be following up on whatever you recommend here this morning. We want to find out how we can take what is the best of our experience here in the State and share that with other States.

STATEMENTS OF SENATOR RICHARD KRAUS, SENATE CHAIRMAN, AND REPRESENTATIVE NICHOLAS PALEOLOGOS, HOUSE CHAIRMAN, MASSACHUSETTS JOINT COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Mr. PALEOLOGOS. Thank you very much, Senator. I know your time is brief, so we will try and be as brief as we can. We are very grateful for the opportunity to come before you and tell you that one of things that has disturbed us most about education reform nationally is that it seems in many states to have become an excuse to make classrooms and schools more miserable for kids, and we are happy to tell you here in Massachusetts we are trying to take the opposite view, that what reform ought to be about is to make schools more interesting and engaging for students across the state.

Most of the other states that engaged in education reform really took a very centralized approach; more rigidity, and more structure, were the most common characteristics of these efforts. We in this state try to emphasize diversity, decentralization, and much more of a bottom up approach to reform. We believe that the focus should be on the school house not the state house.

That approach in the last couple of years has really produced some significant results in Massachusetts and it is because of those results that we have made some recommendations which we have left with you and your committee. We hope they will be helpful in your deliberations. The two most important themes that have come out of our reports you have heard today. One is to empower the professionals at the school building level. That is to say, give teachers, principals, parents and students more power over what they do.

Today you find in high schools and elementary schools teachers who, in many cases, don't have any say over curriculum, textbooks, assignment of kids, the organization structure of their school the length of the school day or year and so on. Most of those things are decided by others. So, what we are recommending first is to give an unprecedented amount of power, if you will, to those people who are closest to the educations of our kids; that is to say, parents and teachers and principals at the school building level.

The second thing that we are recommending is that we must begin to change the incentives in schools so that we are actually rewarding improvement. I know that you are very concerned, and the committee is very concerned with providing some incentives, and not just technical assistance or a pat on the back, but some real financial incentives for the schools that improve. So, empowering professionals on one hand and rewarding improvement on the other are really the two things that our report are all about.

And while we recognize that the federal government represents only five or six cents of the public education dollar, we believe strongly that a little money goes a long way if you put it in the right hands. And the way you can help us is, to put some financial incentives out there for states to do those two things; empower building professionals and reward improvement.

Mr. **Kraus**. Thank you very much for this time, Senator. I, too, will be quite brief. In the reports that you mentioned are a number of different programs which we are urging for the reform and improvement of education in Massachusetts. There are just two of them on which I would like to comment very quickly now.

In the testimony that we took over the last year and a half, two of the statements that came through really reinforce what I heard here this morning. One of the statements was from a teacher who had been 15 years in the classroom, and who indicated that not any time during that 15 years did anybody ever ask her what ought to be going on generally in that school. Nobody has ever tapped her professional talents and expertise towards the overall structure of what was going on there. So, our current proposal, called "Carnegie Schools," is one which grants would be given out competitively to schools, based on how much they convince the Massachusetts Department of Education that they are really going to be listening to the education professionals that are in the school.

Mr. **Paleologos**. Was it some thing he said?

The **Chairman**. Do you get that kind of reaction often? As you know, we are rotating classes here in the course of the morning, so you may proceed.

Mr. **Kraus**. We are making money available up front for that. The second program is called REACH.

The **Chairman**. Would that be financial assistance that would go to the school?

Mr. **Kraus**. Each school building. The second one is called REACH, which is rewarding educational achievements. And it really works along with the statement that we got from a principal in the course of our hearings in which he said, "You know, every year you come along and you ask us for something different in education, and we really don't know what it is you people in the state want us to produce."

In the REACH program what we are trying to do is to use the nine educational goals which have just been adopted by the State Board of Education, find ways of measuring improvement in those goal areas, whether it is by tests or other kinds of measures, and set out those goals as items that each individual school will go about trying to achieve.

One of things which we have often done in education is to respond to "dress codes," whether or not somebody establishes a particular curriculum, put in a particular course of study, or whether or not students "look like" they are learning. We want to place emphasis here on the student outcome, whether or not, in fact, the students are actually learning in response to that.

The CHAIRMAN. Tell me, how many schools in the Commonwealth have participated in the programs?

Mr. KRAUS. In the coming year we hope to have money for about 40. The precise number hasn't been set yet. We have a budgeted item, but we hadn't passed the legislation yet that will exactly divide it up. We hope to expand that in each successive year. And one of the things that would be very helpful in that process, and would help leverage additional state money, would be federal matching grants.

The CHAIRMAN. And in terms of geographical distribution, all those things are left pretty much up in the air?

Mr. KRAUS. At the present time. We want to be sure that we do have a good cross section of suburban, urban, different student bodies and the like.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, we will look forward to looking through the recommendations within a short timetable because we will be doing the elementary-secondary education bill now, and I think there is a real interest in the committee to examine this issue. For the most part, members aren't nearly as well aware of the variety of different things that have been happening in the school districts across the country and what the outcomes have been.

What has been your reaction and that of the teachers themselves to these proposals?

Mr. PALEOLOGOS. As you heard, Senator, earlier and it is probably not difficult to predict that to the extent that you create incentives and you create an atmosphere in a school where teachers are allowed professional discretion and autonomy, a sense of being a professional and a sense of ownership and control over the building in which they work, you get a lot more from the students in those kinds of schools than you do when you try to impose a rigid structure from above.

All of us are concerned that what government puts into schools should improve what kids get out of them. We found, as we looked across the state, that when professionals are involved in decision making, you have a lot better school.

Mr. KRAUS. And on the other point of looking at student outcomes, I think the teachers have been a little more nervous about that because they are not totally convinced that that's the way of doing it, so we are trying to be very careful in the Commonwealth. And actually there is federal money going into that careful exploration. The Regional Laboratory for Educational Improvement of the Northeast which contracts with the Department of Education, will be facilitating a forum in two weeks here in Massachusetts to determine if we have appropriate measures in each of the nine educational goal areas.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me just ask, finally, what reaction are you getting from the parents? Do you see a difference in terms of the kinds of support from education people who are involved in the——

Mr. KRAUS. I think the reaction there is mostly hope, Senator. We have seen recently, I think, a reduction in the sort of parental involvement and parental engagement that we need, and a bit of a cynicism of what they are likely to see coming out of this program. I hope that by crafting things in the way that we can, the effects, the results will be more parental involvement and bringing more people back into the operation of the schools.

One of the most successful things that has happened over the last two years are school improvement councils which are in each of our schools. They have brought parents, teachers, principals and students together in very constructive ways to spend a small amount of money to improve their schools. I think the councils are beginning to catch fire.

[The joint statement of Mr. Kraus and Mr. Paleologos follows:]

MASSACHUSETTS
EDUCATION REFORM 1987

Statement of State Senator Richard Kraus
and Representative Nicholas Paleologos,
Co-Chairmen of the Joint Committee on Education
Massachusetts Legislature
Before the U.S. Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources
Field Hearing on the Use of Incentives to Improve Education
Boston, Massachusetts

5 October 1987

We intend to launch a decade of unparalleled educational achievement.

We begin from a position that is much better than many people believe. Massachusetts, by almost every standard of student performance or teaching condition, continually ranks among the top 5 to 11 states in the nation.

But that is not nearly good enough for the 21st Century.

Our people are increasingly a people who must live by their wits. We can not afford to leave any substantial portion of our population uneducated, unable to fully participate and contribute in our polity and to our economy. Our living standard can be no better than our educational achievement.

Our goal is the best educated population in the US by the year 2000. Massachusetts is to be the best in every measure of student performance and teaching condition.

To achieve this goal, important changes must be made.

First, society is presenting awesome challenges to our schools. Changes in family structure and family support for education, increasing demands on the time students need for study, etc. threaten to overwhelm many of our schools, especially in urban areas. To meet and overcome these challenges we must have a vigorous and concerted effort by everyone who cares about education or about our economic future.

Second, there are few incentives in our schools encouraging the successful teacher. Indeed, we have produced an organizational structure where all too often what a teacher has to say is of little importance and where whether students actually learn has no impact on anyone's career. We must change those incentives and reform the governance of our schools so that our educators can function as professionals and fairly be held accountable for the progress of our students.

Third, we are facing a new century with teacher pay levels which arose out of a society in which women had little professional choice except teaching. As a result, our teachers are among the worst paid of professionals. Their pay will have to be raised by 50% over current levels to be competitive with the average professional with a college degree. Current revenue sources will not support such an increase. Yet, if we are to be able to attract the best of our young people into teaching, it must happen. Therefore in order to increase teacher pay to appropriate levels, we intend to increase real educational expenditures on education in Massachusetts by at least 30% over the next decade. If necessary, we will seek revenues dedicated to this purpose, but only to the extent justified by demonstrated improvement in our students' learning.

Chapter 188 provides us with a first-rate starting point. Experience under 188 reinforces the basic beliefs and commitments with which we began: 1) good education cannot simply be ordered or mandated -- people have to desire it, invest themselves in it, be willing to fight for it; 2) this vigorous desire, investment, and willingness must be reborn and fostered in each and every school building; 3) as the state our proper role is to explain clearly the ends we seek, to tempt and urge folk toward those ends while allowing great flexibility as to local method, and, finally, to reward those who are successful.

What specifically do we propose?

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT COUNCILS

The councils have been such a thoroughgoing success that it is almost impossible to remember that they were a most controversial element of Chapter 188 which only narrowly won approval. Our improvement is aimed at the educational goals set by the State Board of Education: physical and emotional well-being; critical thinking and communications skills; citizenship in a democratic society; values and mutual respect; arts appreciation and creativity; understanding history and the humanities; understanding mathematics and the sciences; occupational competence; and the capacity and desire for lifelong learning.

We will ask each School Improvement Council to decide how best to achieve significant improvement, concentrating in goal areas of most serious shortcoming. To finance this planning effort and the first steps of implementation, we will ask that the current $10 per pupil allocation be significantly increased and that planning functions be added to the list of permitted uses for such funds.

EEO

Some schools face challenges larger than others.

In 188 the only way we had to identify where students were most at risk was by per pupil expenditures. Despite the title - EEO - our aim was never fully to "equalize" opportunity but was to provide a floor to protect those most at risk. This we did by targeting communities and regional districts which fell below 85% of the state-wide pupil expenditure average.

As some of us strongly suspected, expenditure was a very poor way to find where students were most at risk. Now with 188 test results in hand, we can accurately identify those school buildings in which we are failing the students, and we can focus funds directly on them insisting on results in student performance.

We propose to use all future increases in EEO funding to concentrate extra resources and attention on the 200 lowest achieving schools (K-8). These schools will be provided with additional planning funds this year (FY88), and next year (FY89) the entire increase in EEO monies will be used to implement their plans. At each stage funding will be contingent -- first on the existence of a viable plan, then on the implementation of that plan, and finally on actual improvements in student performance.

Each Improvement Council in these schools will be augmented by a broad-based community group to help identify problems and solutions. These groups will be encouraged to think boldly in proposing solutions and in identifying, both inside and especially outside the school building, causes of lack of success in learning.

As additional aid to this process a special corps of teachers and administrators (partly from within the 200, partly from outside) will be recruited to help with the planning and to run summer programs in these schools. Local secondary students will be hired to help out in the summers. These summer programs will help focus the planning and ensure plenty of professional assistance for that process, help combat the serious learning loss which occurs in many of our urban areas over the summers, and provide a prime vehicle for salvaging many of our secondary students that otherwise would be lost.

CARNEGIE SCHOOLS

Educational research suggests that in order to achieve significant improvements in student learning, it may be necessary to substantially change the way our educational professionals interrelate on the job. We want to maximize professional attention on how to educate better, and we want to ensure that the focus is cooperation, not conflict among our educators. Therefore we will offer competitive grants to school building staffs that want to experiment with forms of organization designed to improve their professional effectiveness. Emphasis will be on willingness to set aside, at least temporarily, state laws and regulations, local policies and procedures and contract provisions which are deemed by a local staff to be in the way of their ability to teach better.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SCHOOLS

New teachers are being hired again in Massachusetts. More will be needed. To help ensure that we have the very best trained new teachers, we will identify a small number of schools that now are achieving student learning far beyond what might be expected given the background of their students. These schools will be augmented so to enable their faculties not only to educate their pupils but to help train the next generation of teachers.

MINIMUM SALARY

We propose to provide the same state two-year incentive to raise beginning salaries to $20,000 per year as we did to raise them to $18,000.

REACH

We will enhance our ability to measure whether student learning is improving in the areas set by the state's educational goals and will offer substantial bonuses to the professional staff in each building when their students show substantial improved learning in any one of these vital areas. Once our measurements and rewards are fully developed, members of a successful professional staff will be able to supplement their individual incomes by as much as $10,000 per year. By coupling demonstrated improvement in student learning with substantially increased remuneration, we hope to convince voters and taxpayers to provide the resources necessary to match the average pay enjoyed by other professionals whose work requires the college degree.

At every level of the educational enterprise there are multiple distractions drawing time, attention and priorities of administrators and teachers away from the improvement of the conditions of learning. Major incentives helping all to refocus on the real goal are long overdue. We must take care to ensure that these incentives cover the broad spectrum of what we want our children to learn and ensure that rewards in one area cannot be earned by deliberately allowing deterioration in another.

Earlier, I mentioned the need for a substantial increase in funding in the near future. This is an urgent, soon to be desperate, matter. Unless we show considerable success quickly in the areas of our most obvious problems: dropouts and basic skills -- unless we create a much better professional working situation and the prospect of much better professional pay and thus attract plenty of the brightest and most dedicated into our classrooms -- we are likely to face a crisis so deep and so severe that it could mean the virtual end of public education as it was conceived here in Massachusetts. If we fail in the current attempt, public education here could well enter an irrevocably downward spiral of overcrowded classrooms, unprepared and uninspired teachers, and wasted and rejected youth.

How do we get the funds we need? How do we convince a tight-fisted public to pay more than they are now willing to pay? What will a successful strategy be? We have, I believe, basically three options:

1) we can simply demand more... and fail to get it; or

2) we can wait for the crisis, and hoping that people will put greatly increased funds into the public system instead of vouchers for the private system; or

3) we can devise a strategy like REACH which gradually lays claim to more funds based on a rationale which the public understands, even desires.

A demonstrated and widely publicized record of improvement together with expanded public and business involvement should vastly aid in rebuilding lost public confidence in and support for public education.

Increased pay together with the improved professional conditions which will be adopted to enable the improvements in student learning should be sufficient to attract the most caring of the best minds of the next generation of students into the teaching profession.

Thus by the year 2000 we hope to have both the best prepared student population and the most able educational professionals anywhere in the world.

Where are we now?

1) The legislature has set aside $15 million for our use in the current fiscal year.

2) Actual legislation is being drafted -- currently being refined with splendid help of capable staff within the Department of Education -- and will be filed in about three weeks.

The **Chairman**. Thank you. We would like to work with you as we fashion the national program. Our final panel will be Mr. Keith Geiger, Vice President of the National Education Association, of which the Massachusetts Teachers Association is an affiliate, and Dr. Urbanski, Vice President of the American Federation of Teachers, of which the Massachusetts Federation of Teachers is an affiliate. Dr. Urbanski is also president of the Rochester Teachers Association in New York which has just completed a contract which incorporates many of the ideas that we have discussed this morning.

Since Dr. Urbanski came all this way, not only for the day, but as a refugee from Poland, we'll let him start off.

STATEMENTS OF DR. ADAM URBANSKI, VICE PRESIDENT, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TEACHERS; AND KEITH GEIGER, VICE PRESIDENT, NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

Dr. **Urbanski**. Good afternoon, Senator. I'm proud to represent the American Federation of Teachers and to have the opportunity to add what little I can to these deliberations. Essentially, since my testimony has been submitted to this panel, I would like to focus on the general question of translating the rhetoric about improving schools into local practical realities, particularly as exemplified in our recent settlement.

I believe it can be narrowed down to three general categories: One is the professionalized teaching which means turning a pretty shoddy occupation, unfortunately, into a profession that resembles some of the other professions in our societies.

Secondly, to restructure schools for greater productivity and effectiveness, since the former wouldn't make much sense without the latter. And thirdly, the manner in which we do this is with cooperation and also with some significant willingness to take risks and to emphasize equally excellence as well as equity.

To professionalize teaching in Rochester, New York, for example as we did in several other colleges throughout the country, we had initiated programs that would involve teachers with quality control. We have a program in Rochester for example, now in its second year, entitled Peer Assistance and Review which is made up of two components: internships for new teachers, so they don't have to learn their trade by sink or swim and by making mistakes on the first batch of students, as I did. And also an intervention program so that teachers whose performance is not up to standards we helped to shape would first be assisted. If that effort, a joint effort, does not work, then a teachers' union actually cooperates with management in counseling those individuals out of teaching to dispel the myth that teaching is for everybody, and that all you have to do to be a good teacher is that you have to love kids. That's about as smart as saying that all you have to do to be a good surgeon is to love to cut.

We are now translating this Peer Assistance and Review Program into a career ladder program which may be one of first locally designed and negotiated career ladder programs in the country and will turn a single-level teaching occupation into a four-tier profession.

The **Chairman**. Doctor, can you hold for a second? We are joined by another group of students from the high school, and we want to mention to them that the purpose of these hearings is to try and find out what has been happening in a number of local school districts around the country with regard to strengthening the quality of education in the high schools. We want to evaluate different types of experiences in the hope that some of these experiences can have nationwide application, and that we can try and provide some incentives on the national level for schools to adopt them. That is what we're talking about this morning and we have discussed a number of different programs.

Now, we are listening to the representatives of the teachers and, specifically about some programs that Dr. Urbanski has been speaking about.

Dr. **Urbanski**. Senator, the program that I was speaking about at the moment is called Career in Teaching Program—changes the teaching occupation to a four-tiered profession so that teaching no longer has to remain a dead-end occupation. It would start with internship and progress to a resident teacher and eventually become a professional teacher and then have the option to become the lead teacher.

As a matter of fact, starting teachers salaries were improved by more than 52 percent. And that means that in two years starting teachers in Rochester will earn nearly $29,000 and the tops are nearly $70,000, which I think begins to approach the kind of pay that will attract and retain the best college graduates into teaching as opposed to what we unfortunately are doing now which is attracting whoever cannot get into a medical school or a school of engineering ends up going into teaching, with some very notable and exciting exceptions, but unfortunately that is true, and as long as that is the case, we will not really have the brain power that will give us the results that we want.

I assume though that, as a generalization—quality of the instruction can never exceed quality of the teacher. So, if we have resources, we need to allocate them to the teachers. This year's recommendations of the Carnegie, and I would also like to put in a strong word of plea for encouraging and keeping alive the Carnegie effort, and I think that it would be within the parameters of interest of the federal government to encourage such a nationwide effort.

Along with that we have to restructure schools because professionalizing teachers but not restructing schools really exacerbates the problem. We achieved ours in Rochester through a negotiation process called "principaled negotiations" and through that process we significantly retrenched management prerogative, but also slayed quite a few sacred cows, and I think we have to start with some of the ways of doing things more effectively by actually taking significant risks and changing some of the processes that we have held on to till now.

Since I don't have time to argue specifics, I'll wait for any questions that might elicit that. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Dr. Urbanski follows:]

TESTIMONY

by

Dr. Adam Urbanski
President, Rochester (NY) Teachers Association
Vice-President, American Federation of Teachers

to

United States Senate
Committee on Labor and Human Resources
Subcommittee on Education, Arts and Humanities
Senator Edward M. Kennedy, Chairman

October 5, 1987

Senator Kennedy, members of the United States Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources, and the Subcommittee on Education, Arts and Humanities:

I am Adam Urbanski, President of the Rochester (N.Y.) Teachers Association and a Vice-President of the American Federation of Teachers. I welcome this opportunity to testify on the themes of encouraging innovation, improving performance and expanding opportunities for all our students.

For me, as it did also for countless others, public education served as a vehicle for opportunity. I came to this great country as one of seven sons of little-educated but determined parents who, in 1957, escaped communist Poland in search of a better and a more free life. Nearly fours years, a dozen countries and several languages later, we arrived in the United States. Public schools helped to make the "American dream" more achievable for me and for my family.

My story, I know, is not unique. Yet, I fear that my story is not typical either. For too many students from economically and educationally disadvantaged background, schools - and society generally - are failing.

In the school district where I serve, for example, nearly 50% of all students fail core academic subjects; only 18% earn Regents (academic track) diplomas. And lest we assume that it's the fault of schools only, 80% of all children entering kindergarten are already one or more years behind in readiness skills. Many of our students live in poverty and nearly half come from single-parent families.

Nationally, the statistics are no more comforting. A recent study of approximately 250,000 high school seniors by the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) found that fewer than 35% could read at the level of the New York Times or similar difficulty; only 20% could write an effective persuasive letter; no more than 17% could do a typical two-operation math problem; and a mere 5% were able to read and understand airline or bus schedules.

No wonder that some 25% of U.S. college freshmen are enrolled in remedial math classes. In sixth grade, 20% of our students could not locate the United States on a world map; by 12th grade, twice as many (40%) identified Israel as an Arab nation.

Indeed, we must encourage our students to learn more effectively about the world in which they live. While only 25,000 students in the United States study the Russian language, more than 4,000,000 Russian students study English. In fact, there are more teachers of English in the USSR than students of Russian in the U.S.

We must also encourage our students to study more. While a typical American teenager spends 38 hours each week in class or studying, a typical teenager in USSR spends 51.5 hours studying and a typical Japanese student 59 hours.

Of course, parental involvement is indispensable to student success. It is not heartening to learn that more than 27% of parents say that they never help their children with homework. And 40% of parents said in a recent nationwide survey that they never read to their children.

To address these "challenges," we'll need better schools and better teachers. Yet, the stultifying and archaic school structures - as well as the disincentives now built into the teaching occupation - are yielding us a teacher shortage of unprecedented proportions. Nearly half of all current teachers will leave the classroom within the next six years. To replace them, we'll need approximately 24% of all college graduates, each year for the next 10 years, to select teaching as their occupation. Only 6% have done so last year; little more than 7% have done so this year. To illustrate the extent of the problem consider the following statistics:

- 1 in 13 teachers in the U.S. is not certified.
- 1 in 6 taught a grade or a subject in which (s)he received no preparation.
- 24% of America's teachers say that, if they could start over again, they would not teach. (In 1965 only 7% said that...)
- There are more school districts in the U.S. than there are physics teachers. (In USSR every high school graduate must have completed 4 years of physics.)
- In contrast, there are 40 applications per teaching position in Japan.

How do school districts cope with the problem of teacher shortage? Well, 19% of school districts simply increase class size; 35% eliminate or reduce courses; 39% permit out-of-license teaching; and 41% issue temporary or emergency teaching certificates.

Now, whoever heard of "emergency surgeons" or "temporary attorneys?" Why should the standards be so flagrantly disregarded in teaching? Of course, we'll always be able to find enough adults willing to face the kids. But we should insist on debunking the myth that "all you have to do to be a good teacher is love kids." That's about as smart as saying that all you have to do to be a good surgeon is love to cut.

To improve the learning opportunities for our students we must, first and foremost, improve the teaching occupation. It's not so much that the teachers are the problem; it's that teachers have problems that impede effective teaching and learning.

If one were to design a "profession" that would virtually guarantee isolation from one's colleagues, be devoid of intrinsic rewards and lack most of the important characteristics of a real profession, one could hardly find a better model that the current lot of teachers.

Consider the evidence:

o. Teachers learn their trade through sink or swim. New teachers serve no internship and get little help. As much is expected of them their first day on the job as is expected from a 30-year veteran.

o Teachers cannot be promoted except out of teaching. Consequently, a teacher's status, pay and responsibilities are not substantially different on retirement than on the day that teacher was hired.

o Pedagogical decisions are made by non-practitioners. The farther they escape from the classroom it seems, the more right they have to dictate to those left behind.

o Teachers are evaluated and "assisted" by non-practitioners who can see that the window shades are all evenly drawn, but can rarely assess the teacher's competence or knowledge of subject matter.

o The few teachers who lack competency are neither assisted nor removed. Administrators are unwilling or unable to use the process to ensure quality teaching.

Can all this be "fixed" by the education reform movement? Can even the best task force report be instrumental in triggering significant changes in an entranced institution? Can nationwide reform rhetoric be translated into practical local improvements?

It happened once before - more than 75 years ago. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching commissioned a major study of medical education in the United States and Canada and asked Abraham Flexner, an educator, to conduct the study. Flexner was quite surprised to be asked, thinking at first that the Carnegie Foundation had mistaken him for his older brother, Simon, then director of the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research in New York City. But Abraham Flexner needed the work, so he accepted the job.

After two years of extensive research and visits to all 155 American and Canadian medical schools, Flexner presented his shocking conclusions in a report entitled Medical Education in the United States and Canada (1910). He recommended that 120 medical schools be closed (within the next two years, most of them were.) He told of unsanitary and antiquated hospitals, calling many "death traps." He revealed that students without high school diplomas were readily admitted to medical schools. Graduation, he learned, hinged on the ability to pay tuition fees - not on mastery of subject matter.

Flexner recommended steps that would transform the medical occupation into a genuine profession. He suggested a knowledge base, clinical experience, tougher standards, an internship, professional autonomy, and control of licensure within the profession.

History is about to repeat itself.

Last year, the Carnegie Forum issued yet another report, this time about teaching. Like its predecessor, this study offers the promise of transforming the teaching occupation into a true profession.

Entitled A Nation Prepared, the Carnegie Report suggests a radically restructured school system. Instead of laying out a bunch of mandates, the report boldly presented a blue print for building a more effective teaching and learning environment. The Carnegie Report recommends:

- Restructuring schools so that teachers are at the center of all instruction-related decisions.
- Creating a new National Board of Professional Teaching Standards to set criteria for what teachers must know and do and to certify those teachers who meet the standards.
- Establishing a new category of "lead teachers" who would help to train beginning teachers, and perform other professional tasks.
- Making teacher salaries competitive with those in other professions requiring comparable education and responsibilities.

These are terrific recommendations. But it's critical that they be translated into practical local realities. Education reform debate should not leave us permanently perched on the eve of revolution.

In Rochester (N.Y.) we have already begun to restructure schools by restructuring the teaching profession. Last year we negotiated and implemented the Peer Assistance and Review (PAR) Program that offers mentoring to new and inexperienced teachers (Internship) and involves teachers in monitoring quality within their own ranks by offering assistance to experienced teachers whose performance should be improved (Intervention).

Now we are building on the successful PAR Program and have developed a career path for teachers that would retain them as practitioners while permitting them to achieve leadership roles in matters relating to instruction and to the profession. We negotiated a "Career in Teaching" program that would consist of four levels:

- INTERN TEACHERS will be all new practitioners without prior teaching experience. As is already the case in Rochester, interns will teach under the guidance of more experienced mentor teachers.
- RESIDENT TEACHER status will be earned by those teachers who have successfully completed a year of internship but have not yet achieved tenure or received their permanent certification to teacher.
- PROFESSIONAL TEACHER status will be conferred only on those who have earned their permanent certification.
- LEAD TEACHERS will be selected on a voluntary but competitive basis by a panel that includes other teachers. They will teach at least half-time and work also as mentors; or as consultants who will select textbooks, write curricula, plan staff development programs and direct other instruction-related tasks; or as demonstration teachers who will "model" teaching with an "open door policy." Lead teachers will have at least ten years' experience, work for 11 months and receive a salary differential. They will work with students at risk, teach in remedial and/or enrichment programs, serve as adjunct professors in local teacher education schools, and perform other duties that might be required of instructional leaders and expert practitioners.

Unlike merit pay schemes that purport to be "career ladder" programs, our Career in Teaching plan incorporates the peer review concept and offers additional professional options to those who qualify. Lead teachers would achieve higher status and more pay in exchange for accepting more responsibilities and working a longer school day or year. To ensure that they wouldn't be perceived by fellow teachers as "snitches in administrative training," Lead teachers would make themselves ineligible for administrative appointments in our district for the duration of their tenure as Lead teachers and for two years thereafter.

While the Career In Teaching plan is a logical step in the drive to transform the teaching occupation into a genuine profession, it also incorporates a feature that attacks head-on a major obstacle to effective student learning: the need to match "at risk" students and the toughest teaching assignments with those teachers who are best equipped to accept them, the experienced and expert Lead teachers.

Under the current structure and existing practices, the most difficult assignments and the most "challenging" students often fall, by default, to the least experienced and most vulnerable teachers. The veteran teachers can choose to avoid such assignments - largely due to negotiated seniority rules. There is probably a correlation between that dynamic and the fact that 7 out of every 10 teachers leave the classroom before their tenth year of teaching.

A recent study of teachers' attitudes ("Stability and Change in a Profession: Two Decades of Teacher Attitudes, 1964-1984," Phi Delta Kappan, April, 1986) confirms what we already know: most teachers prefer to teach "nice kids, from average homes, who are respectful and hard working." Very few teachers indicated a preference for "underpriviledged students from difficult or deprived homes for who school can be a major opportunity." Even fewer teachers expressed a preference for "students of limited ability who need unusual patience or sympathy."

All this doesn't mean that some terrific veteran teachers don't choose the most difficult assignments. Nor is it safe to assume that a student's progress is entirely determined by the quality of teaching. Just as good health depends on many factors, not just the quality of medical care, so also a good education and student progress hinges on a myriad of factors - only some, not all, within the control of schools. Nonetheless, it makes a lot of sense to match the most challenging students with the most experienced expert practitioners. The Lead Teachers would adopt a "Clint Eastwood" attitude toward teaching: go ahead, give me any student and any assignment - because if I can't do it, it probably can't be done. And certainly it shouldn't be expected of first-year teachers who have enough to do to just learn the job. Asking rookie teachers to take on the toughest assignments would be tantamount in the medical profession to master surgeons treating skin abrasions while interns perform open-heart surgery.

The newly-negotiated 3-year agreement in Rochester, raised starting teachers' pay by 52.4% (from $18,983 in 1986-87 to $28,935 in 1989-1990). Top pay for Lead Teachers will be nearly $70,000 in the third year of the contract. The pact also calls for shared governance through a school-based planning process. Teachers will play a major role in making decisions about the instructional program and other school dynamics. They will even participate in decisions about filling vacancies for staff positions in their schools. No longer will strict seniority be the determinant for voluntary inter-school transfers. That will go hand-in-hand with the "schools of choice" system district-wide.

The notion of giving parents a choice of public schools is predicated on two pillars of the American system: equal opportunity and open market competition. Schools that have to compete for students are less likely to become complacent and are more apt to adjust and improve what they have to offer.

Yes, teachers and administrators would be challenged more than ever before. But the built-in system of incentives and disincentives would reward some schools and send a strong message to others. Not surprisingly schools that don't have to compete for "clients" exhibit many of the characteristics of monopolies. Because of geography or other arbitrary guidelines, neither parents nor students have any choice. this significantly limits their ability to affect the school, heightens their sense of frustration and often leads to resignation and apathy. It's a tragic but not uncommon cycle that can and should be broken.

Schools that must compete also are more likely to develop a cohesiveness and a sense of uniqueness, specialness and shared purpose. It's the kind of school ethos that makes some schools more effective than others. That teamwork also sets an appropriate context for collegiality and shared governance. It dovetails the teacher empowerment movement. It would be unthinkable, for example to put schools in such a competitive mode while retaining the dictatorial top-down management system that now characterized most, if not all, schools. With their very survival at stake, teachers couldn't afford to leave it all to the school principal and would have to become involved in all decisions affecting their schools and their program.

If done right, schools of choice could constitute the deregulatory move that permits schools to be more responsive to the realitites that teachers and school-level administrators understand best. In fact, getting Central Office off the backs of practitioners would be welcome relief in a profession plagued by too many mandates and too much long-distance decision-making. And since realism is proportionate to the proximity to the problems, serious efforts to improve education are most likely to occur at the school level, anyway.

Theoretically, "chosen" schools should be more productive for students and professional staff. Selection of a school is more conducive to a positive learning attitude. Research is clear in supporting that concept. Teachers are likely to gain interest in the effectiveness and attractiveness of their school if the "stakes" are retention of program and "saleability" to consumers. It is possible that a unique accountability would result from a district-wide schools of choice plan: unsuccessful schools would be compelled to change.

Unlike tuition tax credits and voucher proposals, the public school choice option would not undermine the public schools or drain resources away fronm them. Instead, it would stimulate parental involvement and reinforce the equity agenda already afoot in our district. Schools of choice could then become laboratories for change and innovation, while students and their parents could vote on a school's success or failure with their feet.

Even more important than the significant provision of the Rochester contract is the spirit of the settlement. Achieved through a process best described as "principled negotiations," the agreement is based on trust, mutual respect and labor-management collaboration. Union and management share a joint commitment to the notion that excellence without equity is not worth pursuing; that unionism and professionalism are complementary and not mutually exclusive; that there is no reason not to use the collective bargaining process to build a genuine profession for teachers; and that teacher empowerment must be accompanied by teacher accountability.

It makes sense to us: if accountability means assuming responsibility for the decision and choices that one makes, then teachers, to be held accountable, must not be locked out of the decision-making process. And the measure of accountability should be productivity, i.e., student outcomes. The components of that may include such specific criteria as dropout rates, suspensions, course selection choices, failure rates, aggregate test scores, attendance rates, etc.

Admittedly, the jury's still out on the Rochester experiment. If student performance improves, others may decide that investing in teachers may be a model for breaking the cycle of failure - especially in urban public education. But if there is no evidence of appreciable improvements in student learning then the public may very understandably conclude that they can get lousy results without additional investments - so why throw good money after bad.

The education reform movement heightened our aspirations. And since the most powerful revolution is the revolution of rising expections, it'll be impossible to unring the bell. Increasingly there will be a willingness to take risks and to try different and better ways to fulfill our mission. Increasingly, we will dwell even more on potential solutions than on past problems. Risking failure is a risk worth taking. As Winston Churchill put it: "Success is going from failure to failure with undiminished success." The risks are worth taking also because so much is at stake.

I have learned that in this wonderful land of opportunity, the real division is not so much between the haves and the have-nots. The real division is between those who have hope and those who have none. And public education, as it was for me, is still the last best hope for millions of young people in our country - especially those from educationally and economically disadvantaged backgrounds.

We are at a pivotal juncture and face a critical choice: do we constrain ourselves to merely tinkering with the status quo or are we willing to significantly restructure our schools - even if it means taking risks and abandoning traditionally-held postures? If we choose the former, we'll continue to get the dismal results that prompted the cry for reform. The latter can offer hope for a much improved teaching and learning milieu. Only then would the motto "All children can learn and we should choose to educate all children" not only sound good but also be good and sound.

The **Chairman**. Mr. Geiger.

Mr. **Geiger**. Thank you, Senator Kennedy. One of the advantages of going last in this testimony is it justifies me as being the coldest witness of the morning, I want you to know.

I'm Keith Geiger, Vice President of NEA, and I appreciate the opportunity to testify today. Let me simply begin my testimony with a sad story. This morning 400 teachers in Medford, just ten miles from here, walked off their jobs because of salary and working conditions, and I suggest that if we want to do something to improve the teaching condition and learning for children, we probably could provide the money to the local states so this would not have to happen.

The **Chairman**. We have been joined here by some other students. We are discussing in detail whether some of these programs have national application. We are hearing our final witness, Dr. Geiger.

Dr. Geiger, I started off in this chill last night. We were at Northeastern University at the dedication of their library and they had it outdoors, and I had the rare privilege of being on the podium for an hour and 15 minutes.

Mr. **Geiger**. So you feel right at home .

The **Chairman**. Right at home. I'm rather warm, as a matter of fact.

Mr. **Geiger**. In considering new ideas in education or in reviewing successful efforts from the past, education reformers must take a broad view. What we as a nation do, or don't do, today in terms of early childhood education, nutrition, health care and other quality life issues has profound implications for the nation's public schools, and I might add that as all of the other witnesses talked about risks, I think we can't forget that students are not only at risk in education, but when you talk about health care and other quality life, we have to talk about the total program, and I know that no one is more concerned about that than you are.

At the same time, tougher standards and higher expectations are important. Raising standards without increasing assistance to those who are already experiencing difficulty in school is to doom educational reform to failure.

The first and foremost important thing the federal government can do to encourage and inspire local education agencies is to fully fund existing federal education programs.

But Congress can go far beyond simply building a foundation. Congress must also take part in setting goals and providing leadership. NEA has long advocated teacher evaluations tied to a professional development as a way to insure that there is a qualified teacher in every classroom. We believe all statistics of evaluation procedures take into account the wide range of skills needed to be an effective teacher and that they can provide professional development opportunities to help margin teachers to improve and good teachers to get better.

National teacher centers which Congress first authorized in 1979 provided ongoing opportunities for professional growth. In 1986 Congress authorized a modest program for professional development resource centers as a part of a higher education pack re-authorization, but no funds were appropriated for fiscal year 1987.

We urge you to support professional development resource centers as an effective means to promote excellence in teaching. In addition, we command your attention to the Teacher Skills Enhancement Act, S. 507, offered by Senator Robert Byrd. S. 507 would fund projects to enhance teachers and administrators to enhance the categorical and subject matter skills. Beyond high standards, clear goals, adequate resources and opportunities for advancement, teachers need the freedom to address the needs of individual students.

If we restructure our schools so that they focus too much on test scores, we will miss opportunities to teach concepts which are not easily measured on tests.

Finally, education employees want to work with others in the spirit of cooperation. Teachers welcome the involvement of parents and community leaders, but it is important that these efforts be constructive. The best cooperation results when teachers identify their needs and seek the assistance of others in the community .

The most productive thing that parents can do is to supplement and enhance their own childrens education. The federal government must support improvement innovation which guarantee the advancement of education. Congress must avoid encouraging ill-advised fads in education.

NEA is enthusiastic about the challenges that face education and the role this committee will play in developing incentives to meet those challenges. And NEA members take that same enthusiasm with them to class every day. Thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Geiger follows:]

nea

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION

TESTIMONY
OF THE
NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION
ON
STRATEGIES FOR EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE

BEFORE THE
COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES

U.S. SENATE

PRESENTED BY
KEITH GEIGER
VICE PRESIDENT

BOSTON, MASSACHUSSETS
OCTOBER 5, 1987

MARY HATWOOD FUTRELL, President • KEITH GEIGER, Vice President • ROXANNE E. BRADSHAW, Secretary-Treasurer
DON CAMERON, Executive Director
(202) 822-7300

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

I am Keith Geiger, vice president of the 1.86 million-member National Education Association. I appreciate the opportunity to speak to you today on an issue of great importance to the future of our nation — the need to develop strategies to stimulate excellence in our nation's public schools.

It's time we laid to rest a widely held misconception about America's public schools — that they once were terrific and then became terrible. There are good and bad things to say about public education past and present, and I think if Americans took time to analyze the facts, they would choose today's schools over those of two or three decades ago.

Mr. Chairman, you were a participant in the creation of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and subsequent measures to improve public education, including the Bilingual Education Act of 1968, the Education for All Handicapped Act of 1974, and many others. These were courageous, innovative education reform measures. By establishing and enhancing programs for special needs students, the Congress has helped improve the standard of education for all students, and in the process helped make us a more just, more equal, and better-educated society.

George Santayana's admonition, ''Those who forget the past are doomed to repeat it,'' is quite apt here, because if our generation allows the public memory to lapse and Americans take these critical federal education programs for granted, we are doomed to repeat the past, to return to a two-tiered educational system, and as a consequence, a two-tiered society.

Tougher standards and higher expectations are important in education. But to raise standards without increasing assistance to those who were already experiencing difficulties in schooling is to doom educational reform to failure.

Resources

The first and most important thing the federal government can do to encourage and inspire local education agencies to improve is to fully meet the needs of students served in these existing federal education programs.

As you know, the Senate Labor and Human Resources Subcommittee on Education, Arts and Humanities recently took up the omnibus Elementary and Secondary Education Improvement Act, S. 373, as a companion to the House-passed H.R. 5. NEA strongly supports the passage of S. 373 which would reauthorize these essential federal education programs designed to serve disadvantaged students, students with limited proficiency in English, students served in school districts impacted by federal activities, and the many other longstanding programs geared to help local school districts provide quality education for all students.

Without going into great detail about specific aspects of these programs that serve as incentives for educational excellence, it is important to note here that reauthorizing and enhancing these programs helps inspire and encourage state and local education agencies to improve American public schools. In each of these programs, Congress set goals, and provided leadership and resources to meet those goals.

We can all agree that setting and working toward goals — for schools and students — is necessary to enhance academic excellence and educational equity. Continuity is an essential element of achieving any goal. NEA has long advocated a permanent authorization for Chapter 1 compensatory programs for disadvantaged students, and we strongly support the intent of S. 373 to increase funding for compensatory education programs until all eligible students are served.

By assuming a share of the responsibility for special needs students, the federal government can enhance local flexibility. But, unfortunately, while the goals in many of these federal education programs have been constant, Congress has not always provided continuity of resources to achieve those goals. Nothing Congress can do to provide incentives for public school improvement is more important than keeping its commitment — in the words of Senator Robert Taft — to maintain a floor in education on which to build.

Leadership

Congress can, of course, go far beyond simply building a foundation in education. Much of the progress thus far in public education can be attributed to two other essential national activites: setting goals and providing leadership. Whether a national rededication to excellence is spurred by an historical event, such as the launching of Sputnik, or as the conclusion of a study, such as A Nation at Risk, the federal government plays a key role in determining the direction of national educational policy.

When those goals are specific and encouraged with resources — as in the case of the National Defense Education Act — schools, students, and educators have proven they can rise to the occasion. When the goals are overly general and tied to a dimunition of federal resources — as in the case of the education policies of the Reagan Administration — schools, students, and educators are confounded by a mixed message, and therefore, energies are scattered among conflicting, and sometimes contradictory, priorities.

NEA believes there should a qualified teacher in every classroom. One of the ironies of education reform is that too many current proposals for education reform undermine this goal. The most direct way of assuring a qualified teacher in every classroom is to maintain high standards in preparation and certification — not to undermine standards through ''alternative certification;'' to monitor progress of current teachers through a comprehensive evaluation process — not to take a one-shot measure of a narrow range of paperskills through a paper-and-pencil competency test administered to practicing teachers; to provide professional development opportunities for all teachers — not run teachers in and out in five-year cycles; and to provide professional compensation for all teachers — not set up divisive methods of differential salaries.

NEA believes that every student should have access to quality educational opportunities. The way to achieve that goal is to establish high standards for academic achievement and provide the programs and resources to help students meet those standards — not to scatter scant resources into public schools here, private schools there, and religious schools somewhere else; to develop models for seeing that all students master what is taught — not to set up the threat of state or federal foreclosure of ''bankrupt'' schools; and to vest local school faculty with the authority to make appropriate decisions about teaching and learning — not devote undue attention to preparing students so that they perform well on standardized achievement tests.

Since the Administration has thrown its weight behind many of these punitive and counterproductive proposals, it is up to Congress to help move education in the right direction.

Research

Congress has a keen interest in ensuring that American public education is headed in the right direction. A national research program is the most efficient way of ensuring that the programs, projects, and policies of our nation's schools are effective. The National Center for Education Statistics plays a vital role in educational improvement efforts by collecting and disseminating accurate and timely data used in education decisionmaking at all levels, federal, state, and local. NEA applauds Congress' efforts to enhance the programs of the National Center for Education Statistics. Further, we urge your support for federally funded independent academic research and development programs — conducted with the participation of classroom teachers — that encourage innovation and promulgate success.

Within the framework of current federal educational programs, it is clear there is a great deal Congress can do to that would create incentives for state and local educational agencies, public education employees, and the students themselves: 1) provide the resources to meet the needs of students currently targeted by federal education programs, 2) provide leadership in establishing and accomplishing national goals in education, and 3) support educational research and development that provides guidance to educational decision-makers and disseminates innovative and successful teaching-learning techniques, materials, and programs.

Beyond these core areas, however, Congress can take further steps to stimulate excellence in education.

In considering new ideas in education — or in reviewing successful efforts from the past — education reformers must take a broad view. What we as a nation do — or don't do — today, in terms of early childhood development, has clear implications for our colleges and universities in the year 2001. National, state, and local policies in areas such as nutrition, health care, and other quality of life issues profoundly impact the public schools. What we as a nation do — or don't do — today in education will have a deep and lasting impact on our society, our economy, and our national security. Too often, education reformers have pinned their hopes on one or two aspects of education with the idea that if we fix one narrow aspect of our educational system, we have improved the whole process of education.

Too many people believe that the teaching-learning process is comparable to selling hamburgers or making widgets, and that just because a strategy is widely used in the business sector it will enhance the educational enterprise. This simply isn't so. And, while we encourage all those — including parents, community leaders, and political leaders — with an interest in education to be involved in developing new ideas, including parents, community leaders, and political leaders, education reform must be centered on the recommendations of classroom teachers, who understand the educational process best.

Further, in ways to improve teaching, education policy-makers should consider incentives to keep good teachers in the classroom. Too often, the only way for teachers to get ahead is to get out, moving to another geographic area, into school administration, or even into another career.

With these thoughts in mind, allow me focus on some potential strategies for improving a singular, but vital, component of the public schools: classroom teachers.

Professional Development

Knowledge is not a static quality. Each year we learn more about ourselves and the world around us. Consequently, education employees, perhaps more than any other professionals, are involved in on-going learning throughout their careers. But more often than not, teachers and other educational employees must devote their own time and money to professional development.

Even if local and state education agencies do provide resources and opportunities for inservice educational opportunities, in times of budget reductions, staff development programs are often among the first areas to be reduced or eliminated.

For many years, NEA has advocated teacher evaluation tied to professional development as the solution to public concerns about the quality of teachers. This approach has many advantages. First, evaluation — if properly done — takes into account the whole range of skills needed to be an effective teacher, including mastery of subject matter, pedagogical skills, and interpersonal skills. Second, by providing professional development opportunities in concert with needs identified during evaluation, local schools can provide a means for marginal teachers to improve and good teachers to get better. Equally important is the fact that this process guides individual teachers into the areas where they need assistance, be it in mastery of subject matter, classroom management, or something else.

But professional development opportunities need not be seen as merely remedial. Most educators have a strong, personal commitment to personal and professional growth, and therefore providing education employees with opportunities to learn is considered a perquisite, rather than an odious requirement, particularly when they have a hand in developing their own professional development program.

One approach to professional development which proved highly effective was the program of national teacher centers, which

Congress authorized in 1979. These teacher centers provided teachers with ongoing opportunities for professional growth, including inservice training and cooperative efforts to develop curriculum and materials. Teacher centers were administered for teachers by teachers, not imposd by local education agenices, institutions of higher education, or some other entity.

While the teacher center program was federally funded for only two years, it was widely considered to be a breakthrough in the area of education reform. Teacher centers established a place, means, and materials for teachers to share information on effective teaching practices, classroom management, innovative materials, and other activities that allowed them to renew their skills and enthusiasm.

Even after the federal program was defunded, some teacher centers were continued with state and local resources. But given the tremendous financial pressures on education agencies, teacher centers have not been given the priority they deserved.

In 1986, Congress authorized a modest program for Professional Development Resource Centers as a part of the Higher Education Act reauthorization. Some $15 million was authorized by Congress for Professional Development Resource Centers, but no funds were appropriated for FY87.

Currently, the federal government does provide some assistance to local school districts for teacher education programs in certain areas, including math, science, bilingual education, and special education, as well as resources under the Chapter 2 block grants that may be used for professional development.

We urge your support for resources to develop and support Professional Development Resource Centers administered for and by classroom teachers.

Teacher Skills Enhancement

Early in the 100th Congress, legislation was introduced by Sen. Robert Byrd to support programs to enhance teacher skills. The Teacher Skills Enhancement Act, S. 507, would provide grants for locally developed and implemented programs in a number of areas. The Teacher Skills Enhancement Act would fund projects 1) to enhance the teaching skills of elementary and secondary school teachers and administrators, 2) to provide teachers and administrators with new developments and methodologies; 3) to upgrade the subject matter skills of teachers and administrators; and 4) to provide teachers and administrators with counseling and guidance methods to deal with the needs of elementary and secondary school children.

S. 507 is properly focused on local needs identified by local teachers and their representatives, administrators, and other professional educators. S. 507 would authorize $5 million in fiscal year 1988, $20 million in FY89, and $25 million each in FY90 through FY92. The bulk of the funds in the program would go to local school districts where they can do the most good.

We urge your support for the Teacher Skills Enhancement Act.

Autonomy in the Classroom

While there have been many invidious comparisons between the Japanese and American schools, Japanese educators have high praise for the creativity and individuality of both teachers and students in American public schools. In seeking to stimulate educational excellence, we should not be so prescriptive in educational policies that classroom teachers do not have the autonomy to be creative in the classroom.

Schools work best where teachers are provided clear goals, quality resources — including equipment and materials — and the freedom to work in ways that address the needs of individual students. I'm sure that each of us could give an example of a teacher who helped us get over a pons asinorum because he or she was able to depart from the text and get us to look at a problem in a new way. If we restructure our schools so that they focus too much on test scores alone, we will miss opportunities to teach knowledge and, as importantly, the many different ways of gaining knowledge.

Some educational experts, particularly in response to a proposal of the Carnegie Foundation, have proposed restructuring the schools to provide a large share of autonomy to some teachers and not to others. This would be a tremendous mistake. Teaching is a creative profession, as creative as any of the fine arts. And creativity is born out of freedom. The NEA is firmly committed to setting high standards for both teachers and students, but to equate standards with a prescription is to equate healing with a medication.

School-Family Partnerships

Teachers welcome the involvement of parents and community leaders in assisting with local school improvement efforts, and teachers welcome, in particular, the involvement of parents in enhancing and supplementing the learning that goes on in school. But it is important that these efforts be in established in constructive ways.

The best model for cooperative efforts among community leaders and schools is for the teachers themselves to identify their needs and seek the assistance of businesses and other institutions in the community. Too often, individuals outside the school — admittedly with the best of intentions — attempt to dictate what the schools need and provide some resource to fill that need. In the same way, sometimes parents — with concerns about the education of their own children — attempt to dictate educational processes and ends for all students.

Teachers favor the involvement of parents in volunteer work, supportive activities such as fundraising, and promotional efforts, and schools should consult parents about such issues as discipline policies, extra-curricular activities, changes in class size, etc. But parental involvement should not extend to placing parents in control of curriculum and material decisions outside of existing systems, such as selecting and providing input to school board members.

The most productive thing that parents can do to help improve education is to concentrate on supplementing and enhancing their own children's education. According to a Metropolitan Life Survey, The American Teacher 1987, 84 percent of America's teachers want parents to spend much more time with their children helping support the educational process. And both parents and teachers agree that many or most parents leave their children on their own too much to the detriment of their education.

The Metropolitan Life Survey has a number of positive recommendations for improving relationships between families and schools, and it is important to note — as we are talking about incentives to improve education — that enhancing home-school cooperation can help improve the morale of school employees and the effectiveness of public school efforts.

Because education is not an exact science, some reform proposals which brought about dramatic changes in classroom practices have been based on consensus judgements of practitioners. Others were merely fads. In its search for genuine incentives to improve education, the federal government must adopt a responsible, deliberate course of fostering only proven new methods which will guarantee the advancement of education. Congress must avoid actions that will encourage new, ill-advised fads in education.

NEA is enthusiastic about the challenges that face education in the future and the role this Committee will play in developing incentives to meet those challenges. And NEA members take that same enthusiasm with them to the classroom every day.

The **Chairman**. Okay, thank you very much. Let me go to Dr. Urbanski first. On this innovative program, what has been the reaction of the teachers with regards to teachers' seniority? You have described to some extent the greater managerial role for the teachers, greater kind of involvement of teachers in developing the curriculum and dealing with some of the other kind of, "administrative and education type experience." Has there been a corresponding increase in terms of allocations of resources, and what has been the reaction of this issue of seniority rights of the teachers?

Dr. **Urbanski**. Senator, the reaction of the teacher has been overwhelmingly supportive. As a matter of fact, we have a standard practice in Rochester that is that the union will not advance, will not continue to advance any proposal that doesn't achieve at least a 90 percent consensus from its members. We believe that these changes, the ones that you are referring to, are so difficult to accomplish even in an atmosphere of consensus, it would be an absolute mess to try to do it when we are not sure we should be doing it.

The reason, I suspect, teachers are supporting it, Senator, is because general rules may be objective but not necessarily suitable. That's the best that we can hope for when we are locked out of the decisions. And accountability, as we understand it, means taking responsibility for the choices and decisions that we make.

If teachers don't make any decisions or have any choices, they should not and cannot be held accountable. If they do make choices and decisions, then they will hold themselves accountable. They have no trouble experimenting with seniority in order to improve access, equity and excellence for their students.

The **Chairman**. Will some teachers have more autonomy than others?

Dr. **Urbanski**. All teachers will have an equal level of autonomy, but some teachers will have greater opportunity to provide leadership because they will have greater experience and will agree to do the tougher jobs, and they will actually compete for the leadership roles.

The lead teachers—I will give you an analogy. They would be the Clint Eastwoods of teaching. It is not fair to relegate the toughest assignments to the youngest and most inexperienced teachers, when they have enough to do to just learn the job. It is also not fair to delegate the students who need good teaching the most to the teachers who are least prepared for that, at this stage of their development. The analogy would be, in medicine, the master surgeon doing skin abrasion when an intern is doing heart surgery.

And so some would have a greater leadership role, but all would have control over their own environment so that the kinds of things that were done for teachers, for example, decisions about materials, decisions about curriculum, all these things would be done by teachers and with teachers, not for them. The role of the teachers would be changed from advisory to decision making.

The **Chairman**. But how would you respond to the concerns of some, that the students come from a variety of different backgrounds and experiences and, therefore, on the whole, the students' performances are not really reflective of what the teacher is doing in terms of trying to impart an educational experience.

Dr. **Urbanski**. When we talk about accountability and measuring accountability by student outcomes at Rochester, we do not imply to mean a kind of myopic interpretation of that that is now—there is an effort to impose in St. Louis, for example, where management wants to hold a particular teacher accountable for the results of that teacher's students during the one year span. We do, as Mr. Geiger mentioned, and I agree wholeheartedly, we do a lot more than teach to the test, and I don't believe the public wants us to teach to the test. That would be a disaster.

We are after an accountability that is measured by aggregate outcomes, that is, whether the test scores district-wide go up. Will there be district wide drop in the number of students who fail, will there be an increase in the number of students to attend elective courses who remain in school, and so forth.

The **Chairman**. We are working on a proposal called the Fund for Teaching and Schools that provides money for teaching and other efforts to improve elementary and secondary schools. I don't know if you are familiar with that program or not.

Mr. **Geiger**. Well, I think if we go back to the concept of 1979, teacher concepts on decisions on what is being made in the building is made by consensus efforts by the teachers, the administrators, the Parents in the community and so on. I think we can talk about a concept that will work.

Adam is talking about what they have in Rochester. We have 30 learning projects around the United States right now where we have moved the decision making to the building level with the teachers and the administrators working in a co-operative level.

There isn't any question that if the funds are used in those areas where the decisions are going to be moved to the building level, those decisions that can be made, we are not interested in violating a collective bargaining agreement, but there are a lot of decisions that could be made at the building level that are being made elsewhere, and the funds we'd like to use to promote those kind of activities, we would be most supportive.

The **Chairman**. Perhaps you can elaborate a little bit about how you see the role of local teachers in terms of this decision making process.

Mr. **Geiger**. Well, the kinds of decisions that are made as far as the classroom materials, how we are going to divvy up the students in the classes. It might be that the teachers in the building can better decide how they would want to divide the students with the teachers, and how they are going to decide what materials were going to be used in the building and what they are going to divide.

I think if we can make those decisions at the building level, I think they ought to be made that way, and we ought to be experimenting with that.

The **Chairman**. Anything else you want to comment on in terms of minority students and teachers?

Mr. **Geiger**. Yes, we do know from all the statistics that we have seen over the last ten to fifteen years that about 15 years ago the number of minority teachers in our classrooms in the United States was about 12 percent, now it is about eight percent and it is moving down to five percent, and unless we do something dramatic, probably will go to less than five percent.

That is a disaster not only to minority students in the United States, but to majority students as well. We have to have incentive programs, and I agree that those programs have to begin in the middle schools with encouraging young people to go into teaching, but we are going to have to do something for incentives, for teachers or for minority students to go into teaching, and we have seen in the district where the salaries are comparable to what people can make in other professions, that minorities are going into teaching. But it is not only encouraging them going into teaching, but to put the salaries comparable to other professions.

Minorities and women have left the teaching profession over the last ten years because the opportunities are greater in the other professions to have better working conditions and better salaries. Unless we do something about that, we aren't going to attract them.

Dr. URBANSKI. Senator, I would agree with that. It's not just to attract minorities, it is to attract generally bright people into the profession to make it affordable for them to go into it. Nobody goes into teaching to get very rich, but they shouldn't have to moonlight by going into teaching.

There shouldn't be a choice between dedication and compensation as there isn't in other professions. Continuation, perhaps expansion of the Talented Teacher Act, and I would also suggest very strongly reinforcing your thinking by your question for a federal fund for improving teaching and encouraging minorities and other role models for teaching, but would also provide some seed money, if nothing else, to encourage innovation and experimentation and risk taking that would improve the climate so that we could then with a clear conscience encourage minorities and others to go into teaching.

The CHAIRMAN. That is very helpful. I want to thank the panelists very much for their helpful comments. I'm grateful to all of the witnesses this morning. We are going to leave the record open for any additional statements or comments that the witnesses want to submit, and we want to give assurances to the witnesses and most importantly to the young people, that we are going to examine these recommendations in a very serious way.

We have tried to be innovative and creative in some of our other areas of public policy, in education and training programs, welfare dependency, literacy courses, and other types of programs. We have tried to find paths which have been enriching in terms of education and also in health.

On that note, we'll adjourn. I'm very thankful to all of those here at the high school for their hospitality and attention that they have given to our meeting this morning. The Committee stands in adjournment.

[NOTE.—In the interest of economy, two documents submitted to the committee and prepared by the Special Commissions on "The Conditions of Teaching" and "REACH and School Improvement

Councils" (H. Docs. Nos. 6012 and 6013, respectively, of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts), were retained in the files of the committee.]

[Whereupon, the Committee adjourned subject to the call of the Chair.]

○